

The ecclesiology of N.N.Afanasev.
Patristic ressourcement and ecumenical
prospect in the Russian tradition.

Aidan Nichols O.P.

Ph.D.

University of Edinburgh

1986



UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

ABSTRACT OF THESIS (Regulation 7.9)

Name of Candidate NICHOLS, AIDAN JOHN CHRISTOPHER
Address BLACKFRIARS, BUCKINGHAM ROAD, CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DD
Degree Ph.D. Date 30th May, 1986
Title of Thesis The ecclesiology of N. N. Afanasev. Patristic ressourcement
..... and ecumenical prospect in the Russian tradition.
No. of words in the main text of Thesis 100,000

Chapter I traces the theological background of Afanasev's work in the Russian tradition with its three chief contributants to his thought: Scholasticism, the Slavophile movement, and the early twentieth century religious renaissance. Chapter II outlines his life against the ecclesiastical background of its three main stages: Russia, Serbia, France. Chapter III offers an analytical exposé of his principal published ecclesiological writings, considered in seven blocks forming a broadly chronological sequence. Chapter IV looks at Afanasev's ecclesiology as an exercise in patristic ressourcement, evaluating his use of a number of Church fathers and early ecclesiastical writers. Chapter V draws out the ecumenical potentialities of his work for the reconciling of Orthodox and Catholic traditions in terms of four themes: the concept of 'eucharistic ecclesiology'; the inter-relation of universal and particular in the being of the Church; the relationship of doctrinal magisterium to popular reception; the role of the Roman church and bishop in the koinonia of the churches. Appendices offer (i) a survey of Afanasev's most notable confrères in the Russian ecclesiology of his time, with a view to determining the degree of representativeness his ideas can claim for his own tradition; (ii) a 'placing' of Afanasev within a taxonomy of ecclesiologies, and (iii) an apparatus of notes for the foregoing.

Contents

Preface	i
I The background: Russian theology and the idea of the Church	1
A. Russian Scholasticism	2
B. The Slavophiles	11
C. The fin-de-siècle revival	18
II The life of Nikolay Nikolayevič Afanasev	27
A. Russia 1893-1920	27
B. Serbia 1920-1929	42
C. France 1929-1966	50
III The main monuments of Afanasev's ecclesiology	58
1. The inter-war years	58
A. Studies of the councils 1927-1932	58
B. A theology of canon law 1933-1936	75
C. Two ideas of the Church universal 1934	87
2. The war years and afterwards	100
A. Church of the Holy Spirit 1940-1971	100
B. The Table of the Lord 1952	125
C. Further ecclesiological soundings 1949-1966	131
D. Peter and the Roman bishop 1955-1960	143
IV The use of the Fathers in Afanasev	156
a. The <u>Didache</u>	156
b. Ignatius of Antioch	160
c. Irenaeus	165
d. Tertullian and Montanism	169
e. Origen	174
f. Cyprian	179
g. Augustine	194
h. Denys	200
Conclusion	204
Excursus: Afanasev and the Byzantine canonical tradition	209

V	An ecumenical evaluation of Afanasev's ecclesiology	223
	1. The Eucharist as the Church's foundation	223
	2. The One and the Many	241
	3. Council and reception	256
	4. The 'church that presides in love': Afanasev's theology of primacy and the dogmatic constitution <u>Pastor aeternus</u>	276
	Conclusion	310
Appendix A	Afanasev and contemporary Russian ecclesiology	312
	A. Nikolay Aleksandrovič Berdyaev	312
	B. Sergei Nikolayevič Bulgakov	324
	C. Georgii Vasilevič Florovsky	333
Appendix B	The classification of Afanasev's ecclesiology	343
	1. A philosophical scheme	343
	Excursus on F.W.J.Schelling's philosophy	352
	2. A theological scheme	359
Appendix C	An inventory of Afanasev's writing	372
	Notes	384
	Bibliography	490
	Abbreviations	499

Preface

The founder of the Order of Preachers looked to the East, and since his lifetime, Dominicans have figured prominently in the relations of the Latin and Oriental churches.

Bien qu'écloso sur la tombe de saint Dominique cette oeuvre était en germe dans le goût que le vénéré Patriarche prenait à la lecture de l'évangile et des conférences, à la saveur si palestinienne, de Cassien, ainsi que dans l'ardent désir qu'il avait de prêcher aux peuples de l'Est.¹

In the lifetime of the first Dominican generation, contact was made with Eastern Christians through the founding of a Province 'de Terra Sancta' in 1228.² Finding Eastern churches in a situation of ruptured communion with the Holy See, they naturally devoted themselves to the work of reconciliation. A number of clergy and laity of the Oriental Orthodox and Assyrian churches resolved on full union with the see of Rome through their efforts.³ In the difficult circumstances following the Fourth Crusade of 1204 the Order established a presence in the world of the Chalcedonian Orthodox also, laying the foundations of the 'Latinophrone' movement of Byzantine theologians in the fourteenth century.⁴ At some point in the later 1220's, Jacek Odrowar, known in the West as Hyacinth of Cracow, journeyed to Kievan Russia, though his work there left no lasting result.⁵ Contact with the Armenian Church in first Cilicia and then Greater Armenia produced more substantial fruits, and the Fratres Uniti Armeniae would endure as a Dominican congregation until the

eighteenth century.⁶

In view of all this activity, it is not surprising that the Order committed itself enthusiastically to the project of a reunion Council. Peter of Tarantaise's contribution to the making of the 1274 Second Council of Lyons was such that on the death of pope Gregory X, he was elected to the papal office taking the name of Innocent V.⁷ Thomas Aquinas was on his way to the Council when he died, leaving behind him the little treatise later entitled 'Contra errores Graecorum'.⁸ That title does less than justice to the eirenic fashion in which St. Thomas approached the Byzantines, and follows a literary fashion set by the Carolingian divines in the Filioque dispute of the ninth century.⁹ While it is only a false ecumenism that slurs over obstacles to unity, a useful corrective might have been found in the Opus Tripartitum of the master-general Humbert of Romans.¹⁰ In this memorandum submitted to the 1274 Council, Humbert not only criticised the Latin church for its failure to communicate its own position intelligently. He also claimed freedom for the Orientals in whatever did not touch the dogmas of faith.

In the mid fourteenth century, the expansion of the Polish state under Casimir the Great permitted Dominicans to work in Little Russia where by 1612 the Province of Russia possessed seventy houses, three of them beyond the Dniepr. The work of the Dominican Veniamin in translating the Bible into Old Russian for the use of the (Orthodox) church of Novgorod in the late fifteenth century is a splendid example of ecumenical cooperation in an age when reunion was fraught with dangers.¹¹ The Council of Basle in sending John Stoyković of Ragusa to Constantinople in 1431 looked ahead to the Reunion Council of

Florence eight years later.¹² At that council John of Turrecremata (Juan de Torquemada) played a major part, defending the eventual decree of union in his Apparatus super decretum Florentinum unionis Graecorum.¹³ After the failure of reunion, the retention of a Dominican presence on certain Greek islands where Catholic and Orthodox populations lived side by side proved of help to Eastward-looking Dominican scholars in the seventeenth century.¹⁴ Thus Jacques Goar was enabled by his period as prior of San Sebastian on Chios to study the rites of the Greek church which led to his Euchologion of 1647, the herald of a number of studies of Byzantine history later in his life.¹⁵ About the same time, two other French Dominicans, François Combefis and Michel Lequien were producing editions of the Greek fathers, including such early Byzantine figures as Maximus the Confessor and John Damascene, while Lequien's Oriens Christianus is a storehouse of material on the history of the Eastern churches.¹⁶

While the partition of Poland in 1733 led to the formation of a new Province Utriusque Galiciae in Hapsburg Ruthenia, the sundering of the Russian houses from their natural motherhouse at Lvov led to a slow decline. By 1917 only the house in St. Petersburg remained, more as a basis for chaplaincy work among foreign diplomats than as an integral part of Russian society.¹⁷ However, the founding of the Dominican sisterhood of Mother Ekaterina Sienskaya Abrikosova in Moscow at the end of the old régime showed the attraction of the Dominican charism to Orientals determined to maintain their spiritual and liturgical inheritance in Catholic union.¹⁸ In 1923, at the request of pope Pius XI, the Order took charge of the Russian-Byzantine seminary at Lille, while in 1927 the Province of France

founded the still extant centre Istina, an équipe devoted to the search for ways to reunion.¹⁹ Its journal, originally entitled Russie et Chrétienté, and now bearing the name of the centre itself, provides a useful service of information and reflection on ecumenical relations, its spirit well summed up in the Voies de l'unité chrétienne of its founder, the archimandrite Christophe Dumont.²⁰ From visits to Istina and the bi-rital monastery of reunion at Amay-sur-Meuse (later Chevetogne) emerged the ecumenical vocation of Père Yves Congar. Congar moved into the brilliant Russian circle in Paris which included on the Orthodox side Nikolay Aleksandrovič Berdyaev and on the Catholic André Gratieux who introduced Congar to the ecclesiology of Aleksey Stefanovič Khomiakov.²¹ Khomiakov's thought bulks large in the background of the theology of Nikolay Nikolayevič Afanasev, the subject of this thesis. Since no Catholic-Orthodox rapprochement is feasible without a re-thinking of the ecclesiological traditions of the separated churches, it is to this re-thinking that the present study is dedicated.

In what follows, considerable stress will be laid on the role of consonance with the patristic witness in the evaluation of a theological vision. This is in accordance with the words of the metropolitan Melito of Chalcedon who, as representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch, had this to say at the inauguration of the Orthodox-Catholic dialogue at the patriarchal monastery of St. John on Patmos on 29 May 1980:

Nous sommes venus à Patmos, lieu de la théologie apostolique par excellence, d'abord pour écouter, non pour parler; pour retrouver la théologie des apôtres et des Pères de l'Eglise indivise et, par

celle-ci, retourner tous 'à la parole de Dieu et au témoignage de Jésus'.²²

At the same time, it must be recognised that the history of tradition has continued to unfold. Thus the witness of the fathers to the Word of God in Scripture has itself been appropriated in different historical conjunctures, so that certain themes have been more privileged in one strand of Church tradition than another. So cardinal Jan Willebrands, replying to metropolitan Melito, rightly pointed out that:

Nos églises, ayant reçu la même foi, ont développé par des voies et des manières différentes ce patrimoine chrétien.... Ces évolutions différentes se rencontrent dans tous les domaines de la vie de l'Eglise, la tradition liturgique et spirituelle, la discipline, la manière d'exprimer, de présenter et d'organiser la réflexion sur les mystères de la foi.²³

Hence Afanasev's ecclesiological 'return to the fathers' will be contextualised here within the Russian Orthodox theological tradition both as antedating his work, and as contemporaneous with it.

Such a patristic ressourcement, especially when seen against the backdrop of an entire ecclesial tradition, cannot but highlight the common elements in the patrimony of the Orthodox and Catholic churches. In this way, an essay in historical theology, conducted eirenically, serves the purification of the Church's memory by charity: a major motif in the 'common declaration' of the ecumenical patriarch Demetrios I and pope John Paul II in announcing the setting-up of the Orthodox-Catholic Theological Commission at the Phanar on 30 November 1979.

Le dialogue de la charité, enraciné dans une fidélité

complète à l'unique Seigneur Jésus-Christ et à sa volonté sur son Eglise, a ouvert la voie à une meilleure compréhension des positions théologiques réciproques et, de là, à de nouvelles approches vis-à-vis du passé commun de nos Eglises. Cette purification de la mémoire collective de nos Eglises est un fruit important du dialogue de la charité et une condition indispensable des progrès à venir. Ce dialogue de la charité doit continuer et s'intensifier dans la situation complexe que nous avons héritée du passé et qui constitue la réalité dans laquelle doit se dérouler aujourd'hui notre effort.²⁴

This refaire le contexte, which is the responsibility of the Christian historian, as well as of the Church's pastors, then enables a refaire ensemble les textes, for which the work of the dogmatic theologian is a necessity. Thus this thesis looks not only to the past but to the future, to the ecumenical prospect of full eucharistic communion in a single, conciliar and Petrine Great Church.

I must thank my Supervisors, the Very Revd. Professor John McIntyre and the Revd. Fr. Noel Dermot O'Donoghue, O.C.D., for their kind advice during the writing of this thesis. I am also grateful to Fr. Robert Ombres, O.P., prior of Blackfriars, Cambridge, for his remarks on the nature of canon law. Père Yves Congar greatly encouraged me to persevere with this topic. It is to him that this work is dedicated. Looking back over a longer period, I find that a love for Orthodoxy was stimulated by two Oxford friends: the archimandrite (now bishop) Kallistos Ware and the late Nicolas Zernov. Henry Chadwick communicated something of his own fascination with the patristic Church through writing, lecturing and touching personal concern. Professor Dmitri Obolensky gave me my first acquaintance with the patristic after-

life of the Byzantine world. Many friends in Rome, in the Pontifical University of St Thomas and in the curia romana gave me a sense of the universal ministry of the Holy See for, in the words of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, the peace and welfare of the churches of God and the union of them all.

Chapter I The Background: Russian theology and the idea of
the Church

The theological world of the Russian Orthodox Church in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was nothing if not full of life.¹ Three streams of thought and influence flowed strong. Firstly, there was the traditional Scholastic theology of the Russian academies. Secondly, there was the Slavophile movement whose aim was to create a distinctively Russian theology from native sources of life, worship and spirituality. Finally, there were a series of personal contributions made by men who, in many cases, had undergone the experience of unbelief in a Marxist, Idealist or Positivist form. All of these set their mark on ecclesiology. Indeed, it is not too much to say that ecclesiology was the great testing-point of their aspirations and anxieties. The reason for this lies in the general atmosphere of Russian culture towards the end of the Tsarist period. The question which taxed all reflective people, from the radicalised intelligentsia to the ideologues of the Tsarist civil service, among whom must be counted the Procurator of the Holy Synod of the Russian Church, was the question of the right ordering of society. The quest for the true form of human society had as an obvious analogue a concern for the right forms of the Christian community, the divine society.² The ecclesiological tendencies of the movements already mentioned can be documented from the theological literature left by the nineteenth century Church in Russia, as well as by the exiles of the Russian Diaspora in the West after the Revolution of 1917. More elusive is the specific

spiritual physiognomy of the Russian Christian mind and sensibility. Among the devout adherents of the Orthodox Church, and in the monastic settlements which played such a vital role in sustaining spiritual and sacramental awareness, certain characteristic traits may be found to be of properly ecclesiological significance.³ Their influence on a young man growing to maturity in the closing years of the Russian ancien régime may well be as profound as they are unchartable.

A. Russian Scholasticism

Russian Scholastic theology, like Scholastic thought in the West, was a systematisation and rationalisation of inherited patristic and early mediaeval materials in the light of a clearer conceptual analysis of a quasi-philosophical kind. The natural assumption might be that, while Western Scholasticism would build on the Latin fathers and on early mediaeval Western sources, its Russian parallel would be constructed on the foundation of the Greek fathers and mediaeval Byzantine, as well as indigenous, writing. In point of fact, the Western development was organic, though periodically enriched by translations of the Greek church fathers, but the emergence of Russian Scholasticism in the late sixteenth century is very much a new start, drawing so heavily on Western models and materials that the principal historian of Russian theology has not hesitated to term it a 'pseudomorphosis' of the Eastern tradition. In the Russian middle ages, which are conventionally described as the eleventh to fifteenth centuries, theological literature in the Russian language had been largely a matter of translation from the Greek, supplemented by a certain

amount of homilectic and polemical writing. But translations of Greek Christian authors, mediated by the southern Slavonic lands and notably Bulgaria, were chiefly of an ascetic, moral and canonical nature. This was perhaps understandable at a time when the principal task facing the infant Russian Church was organisational, coupled with the need to set ethical and spiritual standards befitting a newly Christianised people.⁴ Occasionally, the native material is of dogmatic, and more especially ecclesiological interest, as with the lengthy sermon O zakone, Moisean dannom, i o blagodati i istine of Hilarion of Kiev.⁵ But access to the doctrinal works of the Greek fathers would have to await the translating activity of Prince Andrei Kurbskii in the Moscow of the late sixteenth century.⁶ The weakening of direct Byzantine influence is highlighted by the contemporary career of a visitor to Muscovy, Maksim the Greek. His own translation work was carried out via the only common language of Greeks and Russians, Latin.⁷ It is notable that, despite what many Slavophiles would have preferred to believe, the mediaeval Russian Church was eager to underpin its common life by a solid legal structure. Of this avidity the Kormchaia Kniga is the monument.⁸ Its canonical sections, including as these do the canons of the first seven ecumenical councils, canons of certain regional synods of the Eastern Mediterranean churches and civil legislation like the novellae of the Byzantine emperor Alexis Comnenus, were regarded by later Russian churchmen as providing definitive norms for ecclesiastical discipline.⁹

An isolated instance of a genuinely Greco-Russian Scholastic product, anxious to draw the materials of Scripture and Greek patristics into an ordered whole is provided in the early

seventeenth century by the Palinodia of Zaharii Kopystenskiĭ, abbot of the Lavra of the Caves. Kopystenskiĭ sought to elucidate the Eastern understanding of the unity of the Church, but his work remained unpublished until the nineteenth century.¹⁰ Russian Scholasticism was born not in a Hellenic-Byzantine milieu, but in a Latin-Roman one. The spur to its creation was the Unia movement whereby a sizeable segment of the Orthodox Church in West Russia (Byelorussia and the Western Ukraine), already subjects of the Polish-Lithuanian 'republic' since the 1569 Union of Lublin, passed over into communion with the Roman church, thus establishing the 'Ruthenian' church. It was the polemics which this ecclesiastical revolution aroused that were, as M. Gordillo wrote, 'à la base d'une renaissance intellectuelle qui se fit vivement sentir en Russie septentrionale au cours des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles', a renaissance which left behind it, in addition to controversial writing of an ephemeral kind, what the same historian termed 'des ouvrages remarquables où la doctrine est exposée avec ordre, sérénité, esprit de suite, et même avec une certaine ampleur'.¹¹

To some extent, the ecclesiological motifs found in this literature derive from Western debates, notably those of Conciliarism and the Calvinist Reformation. Thus Orthodox polemicists made use of Conciliarist anti-Roman argumentation put forward at the Councils of Constance and Basle, as well as individual works such as Marco Antonio de Dominis' De respublica ecclesiastica of 1617 which argued that the Roman bishop was purely primus inter pares within the episcopal order. The 1597 Apokrysis of 'Christopher Philalethes' shows the influence of Calvin's Institutes.¹² But what will become the dominant theological influence, that of Thomas Aquinas, is also apparent in the treatise Zertsalo

bogoslavia of 1618 and will remain a marked feature of theology in southern or Little Russia throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.¹³

The desire for greater ecclesiastical autonomy in Western and Southern Russia, growing pari passu with the consolidation of Muscovy under Ivan the Terrible, and sharpened by the creation of a patriarchate of Moscow in 1589, was frequently accompanied by interest in and sympathy for the Russian Church.¹⁴ Even where this was not so, a degree of Westernisation was encouraged by way of a creative 'reconstruction' of Orthodoxy in a culture inevitably influenced by its Catholic and Protestant neighbours. Nor was contact with, and partial imitation of, the Latin church a total novelty in the Russian lands.¹⁵ The founder of what became a fully-fledged Kiev school, Peter Moghila, was educated in the bratstvo, 'brotherhood', of Lvov, one of a chain of establishments which used Latin and Western pedagogic methods to defend Orthodoxy against the encroachments of Poland-Lithuania.¹⁶ Beginning, in all probability, as parochial organisations, the bratstva soon transformed themselves into 'corporations for the defence of the faith', and, in a region where the loyalty of the episcopate to the Orthodox Church could not be assumed, received from the patriarch of Constantinople powers of supervision over the teaching of the bishops themselves. Peter Moghila, who may have enjoyed a period of study in the West, either at the Sorbonne or in Holland or both, became head of the Lavra of the Caves, then under Polish civil rule, and was able to benefit from that monastery's situation of stauropegia, or independence of any ecclesiastical authority other than that of Constantinople itself. Moghila managed to transform an insignificant monastic

school into a great centre of theological learning where Latin sources and concepts would be utilised right down to the Revolution of 1917.¹⁷

Of Moghila's own extant writings, the Confession of 1640, the Little Catechism of 1645 and the Trebnik, a 'euchologion', of 1646, the first contains the most material of directly ecclesiological interest. Although the Confession was modified by a conference of Kievan and Greek theologians at Jassy in 1642, its ecclesiology doubtless represents the broad outlines of Moghila's teaching. The Church's unity is singled out for emphasis: the single spouse of the single Christ must be one. Among local churches, the church of Jerusalem is given primacy, on the grounds that it was the first to enjoy the presence of the risen Christ. Later emperors transferred the primacy to Rome, Old and New, since the imperial seat was there. The Church is built on Christ not on man, a reference to Catholic use of Matthew 16,18, though bishops as Christ's vicars are rightly called 'heads' of their churches.¹⁸ In the course of time, the Scholasticism of Moghila's school became ever more sophisticated, drawing on the Baroque Scholastic writers of the West, and notably on Gabriel Vazquez, Francisco de Suarez, John de Lugo, Gregory of Valencia, Robert Bellarmine as well as others.¹⁹ Such Western Scholastic theology, passing through Kiev, had its resonances in Moscow itself, through such carriers as Simeon Polotsky and Sylvester Medvedev. Tension between Latin-influenced theology and the relics of Byzantine theology left by visiting Greek-speaking churchmen from the Ottoman empire is reflected in a protracted controversy over the form of the eucharistic consecration in the course of the 1680's. The condemnation of the Kievan theology by the patriarch Joachim

at a Muscovite council in 1690 had no immediate effect but would later become a rallying-point for theological anti-Latinism.²⁰

The advent of Peter the Great, who became tsar in 1689, was certainly not auspicious for pro-Byzantine minds. Peter's Westernising proclivities soon made themselves felt in Moscow theology. In the years 1679-81 the tsar Fyodor Alekseyevich had laid the foundations for a modest theological school in the capital.²¹ Under his successor, the tsarina Sophia, this 'Greco-Slav Academy' was entrusted to two emigré Greeks, the brothers Joannes and Sophronios Likhoudi. After their departure, Peter took the opportunity to instal as rector Palladius Rogovskii who had studied with the Jesuits in Vilna, and subsequently at Olmütz, Vienna, Venice and Rome. Throughout the first half of the eighteenth century, the Moscow school would be Kievan and Latinising. Peter named another Jesuit-trained priest, Stefan Javorskii, 'guardian of the patriarchal throne' in the interim before his reorganisation of the Russian church on Lutheran-Erastian lines. Javorskii's Kamen very, Bellarminian through and through, angered Peter, however, by its hostility to the Protestant tradition, which went against the grain of the tsar's policy of opening a window on to the (largely Protestant) West.²² Peter found a more accommodating churchman in Feofan Prokopovich who, though trained not only at Kiev but also in the Greek College of St. Athanasius at Rome, was Protestantising in theology.²³ Prokopovich's system, most amply developed in his Christianae orthodoxae theologiae in Academia Kiowensi adornatae et propositae lectiones, offered a minimalising ecclesiology. God desires to unite his faithful in quadam certum republicam seu civitatem compingere quae dicitur ecclesia.²⁴ In his Prima

instructio pro pueris Prokopovič spoke even more impressionistically of the Church as the uniformitas sensus among Christians in relation to the teaching of Scripture as clarified by fathers and Councils.²⁵

The Erastian system introduced by the Ecclesiasticae regulae of 1721, the collaborative enterprise of Peter and Prokopovič which turned the Russian church into a department of State governed through a Synod whose president was a Tsarist minister, naturally reinforced this low doctrine of the Church.²⁶ And whereas

Prokopovič's inspiration was provided by Lutheran and Reformed Scholasticism, the Moscow school became increasingly open after his time to humanist and Enlightenment currents. Thus in Platon Levshin's Pravoslavnoe uchenie of 1765 the ecclesial mystery is reduced to an 'assembly of men who believe in Jesus Christ'.²⁷

In the early nineteenth century, the dominance of the Prokopovičian school was strengthened by support from the newly-founded Biblical Society of St. Petersburg and by the spread of German Idealist notions inimical, at least prima facie, to traditional orthodoxy.

It was just this mounting authority of the school which sparked off the desire to return to an older tradition. Despite the major systematising achievement of the last notable Prokopovičian theologian Iuvenalii Medvelskii in his Sistema khristianskogo bogoslaviya of 1806, the increasingly conservative Russian State under tsars Alexander I and Nicholas I began to look askance at theological liberalism. Between 1809 and 1818 three of the four main ecclesiastical schools, Kiev, Moscow and St. Petersburg (the last erected as a full academy in 1797) were reformed in such a way as to strip the Latin language of its old pre-eminence. The effect was to open the way for a more thorough-

going shift in theological education. Nicholas I's Procurator, N.A. Protasov, engineered a return to the vernacular classics of the seventeenth century Kievan school, notably Moghila's Confession and Javorskii's Kamen very.²⁸ Also in the 1830's Filaret Drozdov, the metropolitan of Moscow, though reared in the nursery of Prokopovič, was seeking a fuller biblical and patristic account of the Church which he would find in the notion of the Church as Christ's mystical Body and as a continuation of Pentecost.²⁹ His influential Katikhizis combines, in its third and definitive 1839 edition, this sacramental-mystical element with the idea of the Church as supernatural society found in the Moghilans. Despite objections that his doctrine was at times too vaguely stated, Filaret may be seen as returning to the sources of the original Scholastic tradition by trying to inject a more marked biblical and patristic element into the tradition of the Schools.³⁰

Before the Scholastic tradition was snuffed out in Russia by the Revolution of 1917 it became briefly self-aware in an historical sense. For the first time in the history of Russian theology, Church history and the history of doctrine were placed on a scientific basis.³¹ Patristic studies profited enormously from the researches of Filaret Gumilevskii, made available in summary form in his Istoričeskoe učenie ob otsakh Cerkvi of 1859.³² Hitherto, the translation and study of the Fathers had been an erratic affair in the Russian church. The earliest patristic translations were made in monastic centres, and took the form of anthology. This tradition carried on into the modern period notably in the Optina Hermitage and the Russian-speaking lavra of St. Pantaleimon on Mount Athos. In addition, there were translations made by individual students, but frequently these

were lost to view in diocesan leaflets, or the pages of short-lived reviews. Finally, there was the work of the professors in the ecclesiastical Academies, at first occasional in character, but with the advent of Gumilevskii placed on a systematic basis. Gumilevskii, together with his former teacher I. Korsunskii, founded in 1843 at Moscow the series Tvoreniya svyatikh otsev.

The historian of Russian patristic study commented:

Les fruits de ce travail furent vraiment considérables. A partir de 1843, l'Académie de Moscou ne cessera, jusqu'à la fin de l'Empire, de traduire et de rééditer les textes déjà publiés. Certains pères ont été édités trois et quatre fois. On a traduit presque tous les écrits des grands théologiens et des pères de l'Eglise. La série complète comprenait plus de quatre-vingts volumes.

L'édition fut interrompue en 1917, à l'oeuvre de s.

Maxime le Confesseur et de Nicéphore de Constantinople.³³

With extraordinary thoroughness, the entire patristic corpus was divided up among the four Academies. Moscow took the Greek fathers of the golden age of the fourth to seventh centuries, St. Petersburg the patristic historians, Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Evagrius, as well as such Byzantine chroniclers as George Acropolitos, Gregory of Cyprus, Gregory Pachymeres, John Cinnamus, Nicetas Choniates, Nicephorus Bryennios, Nicephorus Gregoras and Procopius of Caesarea: virtually the whole, in fact, of what would later be the 'Bonn corpus'. To these writers, the St. Petersburg Academy added the texts of the Liturgies, both Eastern and Western, John Chrysostom and Theodore Studion. Kiev was given the Latin fathers, notably Cyprian, Tertullian, Arnobius, Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine, while Kazan undertook something of a pot-pourri: the Acts of ecumenical and local councils of the patristic era, the Apocrypha, and the writings of Origen, Hippolytus and

Gregory the Great. By way of complement, the journal Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie undertook a collection of ante-Nicene texts: the apostolic fathers, the Apologists, and Irenaeus. And as the century progressed these efforts were enriched by the activity of individual Russian Orientalists who devoted themselves to Armenian, Georgian and Ethiopic manuscripts. In the light of this volume of activity, and the many secondary studies of individual fathers which it generated, Gumilevskii's production of the first Russian manual of patrology was timely. Gumilevskii also tried to reconstruct the theological history of Russia itself, as did his fellow-hierarch Makarii Bulgakov.³⁴ Both men were sensible to the need to integrate positive theology into systematic. Their major systematic works, which owed much to such contemporary Catholic authors as H. Klee and G. Perrone, were extremely widely disseminated.³⁵ In fact, these books would most probably have received the lion's share of the attention of students in the four pre-Revolutionary theological academies of Kiev, Moscow, St. Petersburg and Kazan. This ever-growing consciousness of the presence of the fathers in the official theological life of the nineteenth century Russian church lies behind Afanasev's personal movement of patristic ressourcement.

B. The Slavophiles

Despite the severity of theological censorship, through both the office of the Holy Synod and the academies, such official theology did not lack competitors. There were also wilder spirits in the Russian church, and their attempt to re-express Orthodoxy in society, culture and religious thought alike to the form of Slavophilism. The Slavophile movement, at its origins, was an

affair, not so much of theologians as of philosophers of culture: an eighteenth century type of thinker of whom C. de S. Montesquieu, G.B. Vico and J.G. von Herder had been the most outstanding examples.³⁶ To some extent, Slavophilism came into being as a reaction against intellectual Westernisation at least as thorough-going as that represented by the Kievan Baroque.³⁷ During the reign of Nicholas I, the world of the Russian intelligentsia saw two new claimants for its soul: the 'Occidentalists' whose spiritual home was the Germany of Romantic Idealism, as represented by I. Kant, J.G. Fichte, F.W.J. von Schelling and G.W.F. Hegel, and the 'Latinophiles' whose aim was the closer assimilation of Russian society to the cultural forms of Latin and Catholic Europe. The first group found in the Idealists not only philosophical truth but also an instrument of revolutionary change, using the work of Hegel in particular to excoriate the régime of the soldier-tsar. Here A.I. Herzen, M.A. Bakunin and V.G. Belinskii might be mentioned. The second group, which centred on P.Y. Chaadev, was concerned explicitly with piety and theology as well as social reform, and found their lodestar in the figure of the Abbé F. de Lamennais and his 'Christian Democracy'. The Slavophiles were by no means devoid of influence from German and French philosophy but they sought the future of Russia in a return to the ethos of pre-Petrine society. To some degree their support for and interest in the Orthodox Church and its doctrinal inheritance derived from the sense that the Russian Church was to all practical purposes synonymous with traditional Russian culture. The brothers I.S. and K.S. Aksakov, I.V. Kireevski, M.P. Pogodin and Y.F. Samarin were all notable figures in the Slavophile reaction, but in the

context of theology in general and ecclesiology in particular the towering presence is that of Aleksei Stefanovič Khomiakov.³⁸

Khomiakov's writings on the Church show the characteristic blend of Slavophile qualities. On the one hand, there is evidence of a wide intellectual culture used to articulate an almost mystical philosophy of the human spirit, in which the terms 'love' and 'freedom' are dominant. Schelling especially, but also a number of French writers - V. Cousin, J.G.F. Ravaisson-Mollien and L. Secretan - appear among his mentors.³⁹ On the other hand, there is a deep conviction that only that pattern of Church life preserved in Russian Orthodox consciousness is able to realise the destiny of the human spirit in a Christian perspective. Looking back to the Kiev theologians, with their indebtedness to Latin Scholasticism, Khomiakov could find only a community based on external authority, without that deep inner appropriation which the concept of freedom entails. The school of Prokopovič, on the other hand, typified Protestant ecclesiology in that, striving for inner liberty, its members lost sight of the importance of visible unity in an anomie of spiritual anarchy from which only the State could save them. Yet the ecclesial consciousness of the Russian church combined freedom with unity. For Khomiakov, the Church's unity is achieved through sobornost, a term that would become the rallying cry of his disciples but which, strangely enough, appears not in his own manuscripts but only in the Russian translation of the 'French Brochures'.⁴⁰ Inadequately translated as 'conciliarity' (for it is not primarily concerned with institutions), 'communion' (for it bears no immediate Eucharistic reference) or 'togetherness' (for unlike a purely sociological reality it can only be apprehended

with the eyes of faith), it has no single English equivalent. It stands for a 'fundamental link between truth and mutual love in the Church'.⁴¹ Khomiakov's bitterness against the Latin church derived from his sense that by separating itself from the other patriarchates over the Filioque it had transgressed the principle of mutual love and thereby fallen into error. Moreover, by its tendency to monarchical government wielded by a single bishop, it had replaced sobornost by despotism, both in teaching, the 'infallibility' of the magisterium of the Roman bishop, and in administration, his 'universal jurisdiction'. Thus Catholicism had become an 'unnatural tyranny', just as Protestantism was an 'unprincipled revolt'. Only in Orthodoxy could one find:

a unity ... more authoritative than the despotism of the Vatican, for it is based on the strength of mutual love. There a liberty is to be found more free than the license of Protestantism, for it is regulated by the humility of mutual love. There is the Rock and the Refuge.⁴²

This proposition that only Orthodoxy can successfully conjoin the principle of unity (Javorskii) with that of liberty (Prokopovič) has been termed 'la thèse fondamentale de Khomiakov'.⁴³

When in the early 1850's Khomiakov addressed himself to ecclesiological issues, he by no means put behind him his earlier work in social philosophy. As a political commentator he had already stated his preference for the intimate life of a small social group. He regarded the peasant commune as the best environment for the nurture of personality and the strongest bulwark against the march of proletarianisation. By his principle of obščinnost, 'communality', he announced in an undertone his later concern for sobornost in the context of the Church. He had learnt from Schelling a holistic philosophy of the human spirit.⁴⁴ He now saw in the commune the social expression of

creative freedom in act. But the traditional organisation of Russian peasant society derived historically, or so Khomiakov believed, from the inspiration of Orthodox Christianity. In this way, he obtained what may be called his principal intuition, at once philosophical and religious. This consists in an awareness of the organic, quasi-natural unity of a faith-community, combined with an insistence that this organic quality does not destroy but on the contrary supports the reasonable liberty of the individual spirit. The Church is not a monolith but a union, and indeed, as one contemporary student of Khomiakov's thought has written:

a union in love of all individual members, of all existing communes, of the communes of all ages, and of the visible and invisible Church.⁴⁵

It is because the Church is a transfigured obščina that Khomiakov is able to see Orthodoxy as the perfect form of the Christian Church, by analogy with the Russian peasant commune as the perfect form of natural society.

Yet Khomiakov's ecclesiology also claimed a properly dogmatic foundation. He sees the Church as the creation of the Holy Trinity.

L'Eglise, c'est la révélation de l'Esprit Saint à l'amour mutuel des chrétiens, et cet amour qui les ramène au Père par son Verbe incarné, Jésus notre Seigneur.⁴⁶

The Church was founded at Pentecost, when the Spirit so acted that Christ, hitherto 'exterior' truth, should live in the Church, vivifying it 'interiorly'. Christ is found in the Church as the bond uniting Christians to each other in mutual love. On the persistence of such love alone, therefore, does access to revealed truth depend. Though downplaying the public, historical mission of the Son in comparison with his mystical presence within the

post-Pentecost economy of the Spirit, Khomiakov accepts that the Church's invisible grace-life takes on visible expression in the sacraments. Indeed, he makes considerable use of the Liturgy as a theological locus.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, the hierarchical ordering of the community which follows from its sacramental structure plays no essential role in the mediation of its faith. The Church needs no external guarantee of truth, whether biblical, papal or conciliar. Mutual love alone is 'le dépositaire et le gardien de la foi'.⁴⁸ Khomiakov sought confirmation of this position in the response of the Eastern patriarchs to the 1848 letter in which pope Pius IX had appealed for the re-union of the Orthodox East with the Roman see.⁴⁹ With a certain degree of 'eisegesis', he interpreted their reply as locating authority, or indefectibility in truth, in the witness of all the Church's members when united in faith and love.⁵⁰ Church councils, he believed, and here Florence was particularly in mind, may be formally ecumenical, yet their teaching must be 'received' by the entire people of God if it is to be validly obliging on all.⁵¹ Within the communal sobornost, the activity of Orthodox bishops is not per se a mediation of truth. The gift of truth, inhering in whole people, must be distinguished from the sacramental and disciplinary authority which pertains to episcopal office.⁵²

To the traditional Scholastic theology, this could only seem an unwarrantable division of the seamless robe of the apostolic ministry. A well-informed Anglo-Catholic correspondent, William Palmer of Magdalen College, Oxford, wrote to Khomiakov in terms which many late nineteenth century Russian ecclesiologists in the line of Peter Moghila or Filaret Drozdov could echo:

Whatever share the common faith and charity of the laity

may have in the preservation of the true tradition of doctrine, the mission to teach all nations, and the promise to be with them in teaching even to the end of the world, a promise which confers doctrinal infallibility so far as it may be necessary, is given to the united college of apostles and their successors: and to their public and synodical decrees we must therefore at all times principally look.⁵³

Dimitri Khomiakov, Aleksei's son and a considerable Slavophile author on the eve of the Revolution of 1917, defended his father against such criticisms.⁵⁴ On the Western and Scholastic view, the apostles received their gifts not from the Church but from Christ himself. This makes their hierarchical successors above the Church rather than within it. One should say, rather, that in the persons of the apostles the Church of both clergy and laity alike existed in nuce. Apostolicity, therefore, does not belong to clergy alone. The Councils are not episcopal legislatures but bodies of witnesses to the common faith of all. They do not determine so much as express the thought and belief of the Church community. The Roman bishop, by misconceiving this testimony as a verdict of a legal kind and so seeing this authority of witness in juridical terms had come to think of the apostolic ministry as a set of powers, powers which might, then, be vested in himself. The elder Khomiakov's view of the Filioque dispute fits in well with this interpretation of his thought. For him, the question whether the Western addition of the Filioque to the ecumenical Creed was canonical could only be an irrelevant question. Whatever the legal situation it was an act of fratricide at the moral and spiritual level, an expression of the West's pride and disregard for the East.⁵⁵

Throughout the Tsarist period Khomiakov's ecclesiological writings met with a considerable degree of suspicion in Orthodox

circles. Permission to print was not given until 1879, and a monitum was added to the effect that the author's essays contained errors explicable by his lack of proper theological formation. From the academies, theologians in the Scholastic tradition lamented Khomiakov's comparative neglect of the positive sources, Scripture and Tradition, as well as his downplaying of the visible structures of the Church. Yet, after the Revolution of 1917 the Russian diaspora almost uniformly adopted a moderate Khomiakovian position, stressing the primary locus of authority in the plebs sancta Dei, while not regarding the episcopate in council as simply a delegation or derivative thereof. In particular the term sobornost, and the correlative concept of agapeistic concord, caught on very widely. Afanasev will inherit the characteristic Khomiakovian concern with the Church as a community of love, structured by the pattern of its sacramental life but owning no authority of a strictly legal kind.

C. The fin-de-siècle revival

The third element in the ecclesiological background of a Russian Orthodox growing to maturity at the end of the Tsardom consists in a disparate group of thinkers, many of whom were 'twice-born' converts to Orthodoxy. The combined writings and influence of this group were sufficiently impressive to permit one commentator to speak of a 'Russian religious renaissance' in the early twentieth century.⁵⁶ The writers in question form part of the late nineteenth century Russian intelligentsia, an 'estate' which emerged during the liberal reforms of the tsar Alexander II. Pertaining to no particular class, including aristocrats,

industrialists, members of the liberal professions as well as a penniless intellectual proletariat, the Russian intelligentsia formed a sui generis body, its members clearly defined in terms of vocabulary, manners and attitudes, even when they most disagreed about concrete solutions to the questions they addressed. The most significant common denominator was the ideal of service to the people, shared by conservatives, liberals, socialists and the philosophically-minded alike. From the 1860's up until 1917, this culture of argumentative interchange formed something of a counter-culture to the world of official Church and State although, naturally enough, it was largely confined to the University cities of which Odessa, the home of Afanasev, was one. Until the early years of the twentieth century, membership of the intelligentsia and adherence to official Orthodoxy were widely regarded as incompatible: apocalyptic in its predictions for the existing Russian society, the intelligentsia saw itself as offering almost an alternative eschatology to that of the Church.⁵⁷ F.M. Dostoevsky and V.S. Solovyev, by their reconciliation to the Church, practically removed themselves from this strangely intense ambience. A major sea-change overtook this anti-Orthodox intellectual movement in the period 1899 to 1917.⁵⁸ The publication of S.P. Diaghilev's Mir Iskusstva from 1899 onwards challenged the intelligenty by its contributors' insistence that existence was a great deal more complex and mysterious than the world pictured by rationalists and positivists. D. Merežkovsky's essay on Tolstoy and Dostoevsky in this journal was the first to argue that those two pre-eminent Russian novelists were essentially religious thinkers.⁵⁹ As one historian has put it:

The old fortress of Russian positivism began to crumble on all sides before the challenge of the young poets, critics, painters, philosophers and theologians.⁶⁰

The principal meeting point of Church and intelligentsia were the so-called 'religio-philosophical assemblies' held in St. Petersburg from 1901 to 1903.⁶¹ In general, the intellectuals found Orthodox representatives either obscurantist or a curious blend of rationalism and dogmatism - the last a reference, surely, to the characteristic vices of Scholasticism at its least impressive. For their part, the Orthodox found the intelligentsia Utopian and self-opinionated. However, this gap narrowed in the last years of the Tsardom and disappeared altogether in the diaspora. Some names of relevance to discussion of the nature of the Church should now be mentioned: Vladimir Sergeivich Solovyev, essentially a precursor of this rapprochement, dying in 1900; the brothers Prince Evgeny and Prince Sergei Trubetskoi; Pavel Aleksandrovič Florensky; Nikolai Aleksandrovič Berdyaev; Sergei Nikolayevich Bulgakov. Insofar as the last two were contemporaries, collaborators and interlocutors rather than predecessors of Afanasev they will be dealt with here, however, in a subsequent chapter. Their major writings belong, like all of his, to the post-revolutionary period.

Solovyev passed through teenage atheism to a conviction of the religious truth hidden in mysticism and theosophy.⁶² The curious visionary experience of an encompassing divine wisdom, imaged in a female stranger who saved him from a traffic accident, initiated Solovyev's return to Orthodoxy after exposure to the materialism of L. Büchner's Kraft und Stoff, then the breviary of the Russian Nihilist school, as well as to the attempted reconstructions of the life of Jesus by D.F. Strauss and E.

Renan. Moved by Kireevski's concept of faith as 'integral knowledge', as well as by the account of the God-world relationship in Schelling's 'positive philosophy', Solovyev gradually rejected Slavophilism as too narrow by far in its religious and political outlook. He sought a Weltanschauung that could show how mankind might be united in a universal theocracy, in some public and concrete form of explicit world-wide relationship to God. The human task was defined by Solovyev in ways that had immediate ecclesiological implications that he himself was not slow to pick up. Man's project is to realise a unity between the divine Wisdom and the created world: Solovyev called this project that of vseedinstvo, 'all-unity'. Christ's mission was to effect a union between God and man, which he did through the attracting force of the divine Wisdom interior to his being as man: a beauty, goodness and harmony perfectly reflecting the mind of God. Pre-occupied by what man must do to further this enterprise, Solovyev became increasingly persuaded of the need for a universal Church bearing within itself an ultimate authority. In the last of his Čteniya o Bogočelovečeste, the 'lectures on Godmanhood', he saw the Church as the mystical body of the Logos incarnate. Though the God-man has entered the world, there is still need of a universal, corporate 'divine man', a divine humanity which will be simultaneously a universal Church. The continuing embodiment of sophia requires both the preservation of the purity of the divine principle, and the cultivation of a high degree of specifically human activity: the native genius of, respectively, the Orthodox and Catholic churches.⁶³ But increasingly Solovyev divined a need for a unifying centre in a Church whose mission was the earthly realisation of 'all-unity'. In 1883, stimulated

by the resumption of relations between Russia and the Holy See at the coronation of Alexander III, he wrote the first of two essays commending the Roman bishop for this task. In the second, the unfinished Istoriya i buduščnost teokratii, Solovyev argues that while Jesus Christ is the mystic Rock, the foundation of the entire Church through his hypostatic uniting of Godhead and manhood, and each believer is an individual stone in the divine-human edifice, nevertheless this does not exclude the need for a foundation-stone in the social and historical order, vital as that is in the Church's life. If one admits that Christ gave such a role to Peter, it must exist somewhere today: but in seeking such an independent, international ecclesiastical power it can be found nowhere save in the Roman see.⁶⁴ In 1896, deprived of the sacraments by the generality of the Orthodox clergy, Solovyev received the Catholic communion from the hands of Father Nikolai Tolstoi, having previously both declared his adhesion to the teachings of the Council of Trent, and re-affirmed his belief that the Orthodox Church was also the single visible Church of Jesus Christ.⁶⁵

Solovyev's ecclesiology sees the universal Church as a threefold divine-human union. First, there is the 'priestly' union, in which the absolute and unchangeable divine element predominates. This is the Church strictly so called, the 'Temple of God' founded on faith and devotion. Second, there is the 'royal' union in which the human element is dominant. This is the Christian State, the 'living body of God', founded on law and justice. Thirdly, there is the 'prophetic' union, in which, through freedom and love, the divine and human penetrate each other in free mutual interaction, so forming the perfect Christian society, the 'divine Spouse'. Corresponding to each

mode of the theandric union Solovyev posits an office: that of pope to unify the empirical body of the Church here and now; that of emperor to hold out the ideal of unity to all temporal rulers; and that of prophet, whose task is to keep alive the hope of a greater and more intimate divine-human unity in the Age to come.⁶⁶ Despite his conviction that the 'perfect circle' of the Church must have a single centre, not only for its perfection but for its very existence, Solovyev considered that the separation of East and West was not at the deepest level of grace but at that of institutional forms. Hence he could see himself as joining in his own person both traditions: not abandoning Orthodoxy, yet entering into the fullness of the universal Church. G. Florovsky would comment, however, of his work:

On the whole, the impact of Solovyev was ambiguous and ambivalent; he both stimulated and inhibited 'ecumenical thinking' in Russia... Solovyev sorely underestimated the real depth of tension between the two traditions and could not, therefore, initiate any genuine conversation of the separated partners in the common quest... He gave a shock to Russian thought, but not an impulse or guidance.⁶⁷

The contribution of the brothers Trubetskoi and of Pavel Florensky to ecclesiology was more indirect. By directing attention to the theological richness of the traditional iconography of the Russian church the Trubetskoys not only managed to arouse a new respect for the culture of mediaeval Russia. They also suggested the notion that the liturgical life of the Christian community was itself a locus of value and of truth.⁶⁸ The Trubetskoys' conviction that the radiance of the traditional icons, and the beauty of the Liturgy which was their life-context, witness to the possibility of a transfiguration of

the human intellect by the 'Uncreated Light' of God himself, glimpsed by the disciples of Jesus on Mount Thabor, was shared by Pavel Florensky in his Stolp i utverzdenie istiny, published in the opening year of the Great War.⁶⁹ Florensky's remorseless search for an ultimate foundation for truth led him to the Church, which in his view constitutes at one and the same time a means for the attaining of the truth and the environment for encounter with it.⁷⁰ Regarded by Florovsky as the most original philosophical and theological mind of the fin-de-siècle revival, Florensky's Ekkleziologičeskie materialy was not published until as late as 1974.⁷¹ The essay shows Florensky moving towards the mature picture of the Church as the privileged locus of Holy Wisdom described in his master-work in connexion with icons of the Yaroslavl school. Holy Wisdom may be thought of as the 'germ and centre of the redeemed creature, the Body of the Lord Jesus Christ, that is the created nature assumed by the divine Word'.⁷² Florensky's ecclesiology, which is based on a protology, issues in a Mariology:

If Sophia is the total creature, then humanity, which is the soul and conscience of the creature, is Sophia par excellence. If Sophia is all humanity, then the Church, which is the soul and conscience of the Church is Sophia par excellence. If Sophia is the Church of saints, then the mediatrix and patroness of the creature before the Word of God who judges the world and cleaves it in two, the Mother of God, the 'purification of the world', is, once again, Sophia par excellence...⁷³

The 'sophianic' concept of the consubstantiality of all men in truth and love is evidently a re-expression, via the inspiration of Solovyev's vision of the lady Wisdom, of the central insight of Khomiakov's ecclesiology. As mediated by such figures, the

fin-de-siècle revival helped to create the atmosphere in which Afanasev could take reflection on the Church and its liturgy as the heart of theological exploration of the Christian mystery.

All of the schools and individual writers so far mentioned were, nolens volens, touched by the general atmosphere of Russian Orthodoxy in their time - a Volkskirche, a mass, largely peasant, Christianity, centred on the celebration of the divine Liturgy and animated by monastic centres large and small, great places of pilgrimage or the humble resorts of the pious folk of some local place. It is impossible to finish off this sketch of the ecclesiological background to Afanasev's life and work without remarking on the revival of contemplative prayer in the period and the newly conscious emphasis on the Eucharist as the centre of the Christian life. To speak of a 'revival' of contemplative prayer is, perhaps, to claim to speak of what is known only to God, but insofar as the monuments of self-expression can be a fair gauge of what goes on within, the phrase may stand. The revival dates from the initiative of the St. Petersburg theologian Gabriel Petrov, in commissioning a Russian translation of the Greek spiritual anthology known as the Philokalia. The translation of the Dobrotoliubie, stimulated by the ascetic and God-centred life of Tikhon Zadonsky, bishop of Voronezh and inspirer of Dostoevsky's 'Father Zosima' in The Brothers Karamazov, not only attracted more students of patristic and Byzantine spirituality.⁷⁴ It also enabled many ordinary folk to come closer to the essentials of their religion, as is evidenced by the much-loved Otkrovennye rasskazy strannika dukhovnomu svoemy otsu, published in Kazan in 1870.⁷⁵ The monks who were the animators of this spiritual

renaissance constructed no doctrine of the Church. Yet, as Paul Evdokimov wrote:

They initiated their disciples into a living ecclesiology, based on experience and centred on the Holy Spirit.⁷⁶

This Russian re-reception of the Byzantine Hesychast tradition was passed on from the translator of the Philokalia, Theophan the Recluse, to the influential parish priest, Joann Ilyiĭ Sergiev, better known as Father John of Kronstadt. John's Moia žizn vo Christe recalled the sacramental, and above all eucharistic, emphases of the similarly titled Peri tēs en Christō zōēs by the fourteenth century Byzantine layman, Nicholas Cabasilas.⁷⁷ Intuitions such as John's grasp of the Christian ministry as essentially eucharistic were not given any very explicit, propositional form. Much less were they worked out at the level of learned theology. Still, they may be regarded as the spiritual source of the 'eucharistic ecclesiology' of a figure like Afanasev in the modern period.

Chapter II The life of Nikolay Nikolayevich Afanasev

A. Russia 1893-1920

N.N. Afanasev was born at Odessa, on the Black Sea coast of southern Russia, on the fourth of September (by the 'old style' or Julianic calendar) 1893.¹ He grew up in an atmosphere of traditional Orthodox piety.² After school he began studies at the University of Novorossiysk, enrolling in the faculties of, first, medicine and then mathematics. These years of childhood, adolescence and student life, abruptly terminated by the outbreak of the Great War in August 1914, coincided with a major upheaval in Russian politics, an upheaval with marked social, cultural and religious repercussions.³ So far as the Church was concerned, the revolution of 1905 and the turbulent years that preceded it produced a ferment of self-criticism and (largely abortive) aspirations to reform. This means, in effect, that the young Afanasev barely knew that style of unquestioned and unquestioning dominance as the established religion which Orthodox churchmen had accepted gratefully from the hands of the Tsarist autocracy up until the middle years of the reign of Nicholas II. He was a child not so much of pre-revolutionary Russia as of inter-revolutionary Russia, the perilous years between 1905 and 1917. In order to indicate something of the change in climate in Church circles while Afanasev was growing to adult consciousness, a few words on the Church history of this period may be in order.⁴

The 'revolution' of 1905 occurred when Afanasev was twelve years old. During the brief flirtation of the Tsardom with

constitutional forms which followed, the Orthodox Church of Russia was promised a reform council or Sobor which would remedy the defects of ecclesiastical discipline and organisation.⁵ This council was not in fact called until the downfall of the autocracy but its preparation involved the making of substantial official dossiers as well as a great deal of journalistic activity, popular discussion and debates on Church affairs in the various Dumas or Parliaments. Three distinct 'moments' in the shifting self-consciousness and pattern of power in the Russian Church should therefore be recorded. First, there is the conservative status quo of the Church on the eve of the revolution of 1905; secondly, the confused inter-revolutionary period when reform was 'in the air', a threat to some, a promise to others; finally, the reaping of the whirlwind, 1917, the year of two revolutions in the State and in the Church the long-awaited day of the Sobor and with it the restoration of the Patriarchate. By this time Afanasev would be a man of twenty-four, initiated at University level in mathematics and medicine, and with some experience of active service in the Great War behind him. From this background he would draw many of the pre-occupations which colour his writing: the concern with the Church's freedom from the State, the relative rôles of laity and clergy in the determination of Church policy, the inter-relation of episcopal and patriarchal authority, and finally, the way the Church appears in the world, the primacy of agapé.

I. The period 1893 to 1905 was a time of administrative stasis in the Russian Church. At the turn of the century the Church found itself tied (none too unwillingly) to the tottering fortunes of the Romanov monarchy. It endured this Erastian situation

because of the many privileges it received. Its primary legal privileges were first, the right of censorship of non-Orthodox literature; second, political representation, for instance in the provincial zemstvo, 'assembly'; thirdly, the fact that provincial governors were expected to restrain the missionary endeavours of non-Orthodox churches or sects. The Church was governed, as it had been since the time of Peter I, by a governmental ministry, the Holy Synod, on to which ecclesiastics were co-opted. The real ruler of the Church was the civil servant heading this department, the Procurator. Although in theory the Tsar was the all-powerful protector of the Church, appeals to him from the Synod could only be made in the case of failure to reach unanimous decisions, and even then they were entirely at the discretion of the Procurator. However, nowhere did Russian law explicitly forbid the emperor to intervene personally in matters of faith and doctrine, and Nicholas II did so on several occasions, usually in order to secure the canonisation of members of the Church, most notably that of the hermit-mystic Seraphim of Sarov in 1903.⁶ Bishops had no right to approach the Tsar individually except on the Procurator's say-so, and the choice of which bishops might attend the Synod was entirely his. The most important subsidiary figures of the Church were not the bishops but the permanent lay officials of the synodal chanceries. The sheer size of the dioceses prevented the bishops from winning any intimate relationship with their people to set against this State domination. And in any case their working day was grossly over-burdened with red-tape passed on to them by synodal clerks.

The situation of the parish clergy was not greatly enviable either. The diocesan consistory, itself governed by lay officials

appointed by the Synod, kept them in their place by due rewards and punishments. In the case of refractory priests the government could invoke the threat of relegation to a monastery, and in the gravest cases confinement in the monastic prisons run by the Synod. Contrary to popular belief, however, the number of detainees was extremely small. All in all the power wielded by the Procurator over human lives was considerable, when one bears in mind that in 1900 the estimated number of secular clerics (priests, deacons and psalmists) was 104,446; the number of monks 16,668 and the number of nuns 41,615 in a total Orthodox population within the Empire of 83,739,659.⁷

At the heart of the Church's glittering ritual was the Tsar, the living icon of Christ the Pantokrator. Apart from celebrating his coronation, bright lithographed pictures of which were to be found in every Orthodox home, the clergy were obliged to support the imperial government both in public preaching and in private vigilance vis-à-vis their parishioners. A good example of the imperial ideology may be found in the published sermons of archbishop Nikanor of Kherson, a number of which have in mind the case of Leo Tolstoy, excommunicated in 1901 for his religious and social views. In expounding his theology of the imperial office, Nikanor asks:

Who of all mortals on earth can be more sacred than the anointed of God, the God-chosen Tsar? What is more inviolable than his life, with which is so closely linked the whole life of the whole Fatherland? What is more obligatory than the oath, established and blessed by God, of loyalty to the Tsar, even under death, unto the shedding of his blood by each of his most loyal subjects?

And he explains,

When shedding our blood for the Tsar we shed it for all that is on earth most holy, dear and beloved - for our faith and sacred things, for our churches and the tombs of our ancestors, for our fathers and brothers, for wives and children, for the family hearth and the family well-being....⁸

This amounts to a patriotic and Romantic re-writing of the Byzantine theocratic tradition, but it is none the less potent for that. Nevertheless, the evidence is that in this period Church and Tsar alike were rapidly losing support, and more especially the former. The gulf between the Church and the intelligentsia has been touched on in the first chapter; doctrinaire socialism had made considerable inroads among the industrial working class. The peasantry's adhesion was firmer, but even there populist groups like the Old Believers and the sectarian Molokane, Dukhobortsy and Stundists had more support than the official Church cared to concede.

This withering of support is all the more remarkable given the vast resources of influence and propaganda which the Church possessed in this period. In the 1880's the Procurator K.B. Pobedonostsev had convinced the Tsar of the desirability of handing over the educational system of the Empire, where possible, to the Orthodox Church whose loyalty to the autocratic principle was proven.⁹ By 1898 the majority of schools were Church-run, although numerically their pupils amounted to only just over a third of the total. The reason for this discrepancy is that half the Orthodox schools were tiny 'schools of literacy', makeshift affairs whose teachers were little older than the children themselves. Church schools had seven hours of compulsory religious education in Bible, catechism and liturgy, given by the

local priest or deacon; religion was mandatory on the syllabus of the remaining ministerial schools also. The seminaries were an integrated part of the educational system; sympathetic critics found them outstanding primarily for their martinet-like discipline. The four theological Academies, however, those of Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kiev and Kharkov, were in a much better state.

A constant feature of the public complaints about Church life which the revolution of 1905 unleashed would be the unsatisfactory condition, in this period, of the episcopal office. Given the pivotal rôle of the bishop in the Orthodox vision of the Church, it was surprising, to say the least, that the episcopate was so distanced from the lower clergy and the people and comported themselves more as a kind of ecclesiastical higher bureaucracy than as bearers of the apostolic ministry. As one would-be reformer asked, after describing the personal state in which a bishop was required by law to carry out his visitations:

Is it remarkable that the Russian bishop ... appears to the majority only as a high religious official, as a sort of General of Religion, and that he has lost much of his authority as the first of God's servitors?¹⁰

II. The revolution of 1905 brought in a blast of cold air from which the Russian Church of the ancien régime would never again be wholly sheltered. The Tsardom's temporary loss of control and loss of nerve on 9 January 1905 was the culmination of a series of shocks to the autocracy's system: widespread peasant disorders, military defeat by Japan, the assassination of the leading minister Pleve, the demand of the zemstvos for constitutional government and a workers' strike in St. Petersburg. In general

it may be said that whereas the struggle for political innovation and reform seems to have attracted comparatively few of the clergy, the movement for ecclesiastical reform was enthusiastically endorsed by many churchmen, both high and low. There had been straws in the wind already. A conservative newspaper, Moskovskii Vedomosti, had been urging for some time the revival of the patriarchate, although it wanted the patriarchal throne to be established in St. Petersburg rather than the traditional Moscow. The 'religio-philosophical assemblies' (described in the preceding chapter) had pleaded for reforms to be instituted by a Church council as a way of making the Russian Church fit for the intelligentsia to live in. Late in December the Tsar himself issued an ukaz, decree, promising a number of religious reforms including a wider measure of toleration for the non-Orthodox. This ukaz was dated precisely three weeks prior to the revolution: inevitably, then, its issue would depend on the outcome of the struggle for power among the emperor's advisers and subjects. The Chief Minister, Count Witte, proposed a Sobor to remedy the deficiencies of the Church, arguing that the Petrine pattern had perverted it into a dry State institution, formalist, non-participatory, bureaucratic and uninspired. The Procurator, Pobedonostsev, sturdily defended the system in possession until in mid-March the emperor referred the matter to the Holy Synod itself.

The bishop-members of the Synod, freed for the while from the rule of the Procurator, asked that the Russian Church should be governed in future by a council of their own number, and they undertook to carry out thereby most of the concrete reforms proposed by Witte. When this proposal was made public it at

once aroused the fears of the white (or married) clergy, and of many laypeople, not to mention a number of theologians and editors of Church periodicals. Such a narrow application of the conciliar principle was suggested, they alleged, by the desire to strengthen the position of the episcopate and in particular of the monastic estate from which bishops were drawn, at the expense of the rest. For the furthering of this end, government by bishops under the headship of a patriarch would serve only too well. In July 1905 the Synod invited proposals for reform from the head of each diocese. Sixty-two had replied by the end of the year and the tenor of these documents, along with the general slipping of autocratic control, induced the Tsar to summon a 'pre-Sobor' in January 1906. The new Procurator, Prince Obolenskii, was ordered to attend but no other laymen or lower clergy were present. The composition of the pre-Sobor disappointed liberals; its calling angered conservatives. Not surprisingly on recent showing, the pre-Sobor conference asked for ecclesiastical self-government in which lower clergy and laity should have a consultative, and bishops an executive share. Nicholas II promised that they should have their way when a 'favourable time' came. Within two years, however, the revolutionary wave was largely spent, and the government felt temporarily strong enough to manage without more representative assemblies. The paring down of the powers of successive Dumas was mirrored in the deepening silence surrounding the projected Sobor.

Meanwhile the position of the Church in the country was deteriorating at an alarming rate. Of this decline in fortunes the teenage Afanasev may have caught some echo. The extension of

religious toleration in 1905 had led to numerous reversions from Orthodoxy to Catholicism, as well as some new conversions, and heady growth for both Old Believers and the sects, several of whom composed their differences in order to enter an evangelical alliance at Rostov-on-the-Don in the spring of 1906. The almost universally hostile reaction of the Synod and episcopate to demands for political reform further alienated wide sectors of Russian society, though in fairness it must be added that they showed a similar unwillingness to support the extreme actions of ultra-reactionary clerics. By 1908, however, the Synod was sufficiently alarmed by the threat to order in the Empire to give covert support to the notorious counter-revolutionary organisation the 'Union of the Russian People'. Their efforts to stem the tide were not notably successful. In the second Duma, 396 deputies opposed the privileges of the Church, while only 122 either supported them or kept silent.¹¹ In 1909 a group of newly converted Orthodox spokesmen, men of the intelligentsia described in Chapter I, produced the essay-collection Vekhi which drew attention to the decay not only of the Church but of the intelligentsia itself, and tried to identify its causes.¹² In 1918 a similar group, including most of the original contributors to Vekhi, would collaborate in the making of Iz glubiny, a lament 'out of the depths' over the fate of a society that had failed to heed the prophetic warnings of 1909.¹³

In 1912 there was some slight revival of interest in the ill-fated Sobor. Some hoped that the Tsar would take the opportunity of the celebrations for the tercentenary of the accession of the house of Romanov, due the following year, to

summon the long-awaited council. During the Great War which wrote its bloody signature on the new Romanov century priest-deputies of various parties petitioned the Duma to reform the structure of dioceses and parishes through the Sobor. In 1916 the Duma recommended to the Tsar its immediate convocation. Swift changes of Procurator left Synod and Church more uncertain than ever. Curiously, the scale of economic subvention to the Church rose dramatically during the last years of the Tsardom, with the partial exception of the war years themselves. Though all parties except those of the Right were critical of the Church's administration all save the Cadets and those of the extreme Left valued its existence. The Rasputin affair, noted by the press as early as 1912, demonstrated the dangers of imperial control: had Rasputin and the imperial family prospered it is likely that the trickle of episcopal candidates drawn from his worthless followers would have become a flood. The tercentenary celebrations of the Romanov dynasty were the occasion of virtually unprecedented liturgical splendour, the wonder-working icon of the Pochaevskaia monastery brought by train to St. Petersburg where it was met by Church dignitaries and conveyed in triumphant procession to the 'Kazan' cathedral for a Te Deum presided over by the Orthodox patriarch of Antioch.¹⁴ A little later, a parliamentary commission was reporting:

When we study the reports of the Most Holy Synod our attention is drawn to the regularly recurring phenomenon that, even with the agreement of the legal institutions, of the pre-Sobor conference, and in part of the Most Holy Synod, on the necessity of certain reforms, these reforms have not been realised; the institutions remain as archaic as before, and the condition of things continues to be exceedingly unsatisfactory, even hopeless... But to live

longer in this fashion is impossible. We must heal ourselves of this paralysis, we must become active; weakness and lack of purpose must be replaced by energy and strength. For this it will be necessary ... with the united simultaneous efforts of the whole Church, of all its members, to move it from that dead centre on which it has stood for many centuries.¹⁵

Alas, these words were written on the eve of the revolution of 1917.

III. The abdication of the Tsar Nicholas II and the advent of the liberal republic in the revolution of March 1917 at last made possible the long-awaited Sobor.¹⁶ The actual form which the council took was a victory for Slavophiles and liberals in the Russian Church. It was a joint clerical and lay affair, and the governmental structure which it laid down for the future was a similar conspiratio of clergy and people. While re-establishing the patriarchate, it ordained that the management of the Church's affairs should be divided between the patriarch (whose throne was to be in Moscow), a Synod composed of metropolitans and bishops and a 'Supreme Ecclesiastical Council' composed partly of priests and partly of laymen, the former elected by the clergy and the latter by the parishioners. Whether such a parliamentary model was supported by the best ecclesiology was a point to which the mature Afanasev would return. Somewhat sooner after the event, another exiled Russian writer, Nicolas Brianchinov, commented:

The participation of laity and lower clergy in the councils of the Russian Church was an innovation of the nineteenth century, when, under the influence of Slavophile doctrines, energetically maintained and propagated by Aksakov, Khomiakov and Samarine, the view developed that all

great religious questions ought to be decided 'counselwise' (soborno), for the reason that the Russian Church was a body composed not merely of ecclesiastics, but also of all the lay faithful, every one of whom had his rights and duties vis-à-vis the Church. In spite of this tendency towards reposing the Russian Church upon purely democratic bases, however, no other Church in the course of history has so stubbornly defended the purest monarchical principles. But that is only one of the contradictions in Russian 'reality'.¹⁷

Be this as it may, the new structure of the Orthodox community in Russia was itself only achieved with the assistance of the Provisional (Republican) Government. The new government saw the Orthodox as primus inter pares among the religious confessions of the land. They were to enjoy certain privileges, such as the keeping of their feast-days as public holidays, and financial support from the State, provided that they did not abuse their position to attack other confessions. The Church was to be free to legislate for itself, though the State reserved the right to suspend laws passed by ecclesiastical authority if these conflicted with secular legislation. A member of the moderate conservative group, V.N. Lvov, was made Procurator with the remit of realising this programme. Lvov behaved much like the Tsarist Procurators, especially in claiming the right to purge the episcopate, primarily of Rasputin's supporters. However, the rather more Left-wing cabinet of July 1917 replaced Lvov by A.V. Kartashev who succeeded in having his own post abolished in favour of the more neutral office of a minister of confessions. After this point (5 August 1917), the Church was free to act.

The proceedings of the Sobor were presided over by the moderate, and popular, metropolitan Tikhon (Belavin) of Moscow, assisted by a second metropolitan, the conservative Anthony

(Khrapovitsky) of Kharkov (and later of Kiev), and one other bishop. They were joined in this task by two priests, and two laymen, rather more radical, or at least centrist, figures. Owing to the slowness of the Sobor's procedures, and despite its voluminous inheritance from the preparatory commissions set to work under the Tsardom, the restoration of the patriarchate did not take place until after the start of the Bolshevik Revolution in October. More precisely, it was during a brief period towards the end of that month when the palace and cathedral of the Kremlin were in anti-Bolshevik hands. The patriarch, as senior bishop, stood at the head of the Church's administration but it was made clear that both he and any other organs of Church government were subject in the last resort to a Council of bishops, priests and people. By the time of the actual election to the patriarchate, the Uspensky cathedral in the Kremlin was inaccessible, as the Communists had made it their headquarters. So the vote was taken in the cathedral of the Saviour, later blown up by Stalin. A majority supported the candidature of Anthony of Kiev, but a choice by drawing lots, following the procedure for the election of the apostle Matthias in Acts 1, led to the elevation of Tikhon of Moscow on 5 November. On the 21st of that month he was enthroned at the Uspensky, the last Christian Liturgy to be celebrated in that building.¹⁸

The Sobor continued its work right into the autumn of 1918. One of its more controversial decisions was the parish law which made of each local Orthodox community a democratically governed and, in principle, self-supporting body. In September the Council terminated its own existence. It left a patriarch assisted in his government by two organs. The Synod of twelve

diocesan bishops was to deal with matters of faith, worship, discipline and education, while the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council, consisting of three bishops, five priests, six laymen and one monk, were to concentrate especially on questions of national interest, above all relations with the State. This was a most delicate matter after the Bolshevik seizure of power; indeed by this date the Orthodox Church was in effect in a situation of persecution.¹⁹ At the end of 1917 the Church lands had been expropriated. This was economically disabling, but a pinprick compared with the body-blow of the closure of the theological schools and the confiscation of their libraries which followed. The Bolshevik government proceeded to impose on the Church a form of congregationalism suggested by the principle divide et impera. Believers were permitted to form groups of twenty persons. These lay associations could hire church buildings, vestments and vessels from the local soviet for the celebration of the Liturgy. Otherwise, no other type of ecclesiastical organisation was to be tolerated. On 19 January 1918 the patriarch Tikhon took the step of excommunicating those responsible for these decisions and their execution. But the result was an intensification of pressure. The clergy were deprived of their citizenship rights, and all monasteries and convents suppressed.²⁰

It will be understood that the alienating effect of these measures on the Orthodox faithful was considerable, and that an alliance between the 'White' or Tsarist forces and those believers able to bear arms was virtually inevitable. In August 1918 the White Army reached Novorossiysk, where Afanasev, after his demobilisation from an imperial regiment of artillery on the

outbreak of the October Revolution, had returned to his studies in the faculty of mathematics, as well as working in a bank to help sister, mother and grandmother make ends meet. The effect of the arrival of the Whites in southern Russia was considerable on both politics and religion.²¹ Though Odessa, Afanasev's home city, was Great Russian in character it lay in Little Russia, the Ukraine. A good deal of the old Tsarist Ukraine had now changed hands several times. Amid the confusing changes of government - Nationalist, Bolshevist, German, Nationalist again, Bolshevist again, and finally White - the attempt to create an autocephalous Orthodox church of the Ukraine had only added to the chaos. The emergence of a series of jurisdictionally splintered Church bodies probably helped awaken Afanasev's disapproval of Erastian and national churches. Peter Plank has argued that it was experience of these jurisdictional splits, along with those which followed later among Great Russians at home and abroad, that led Afanasev to seek an ecclesiology in which the concepts of law and jurisdiction would have no place.²² The murder of the metropolitan Vladimir (Bogoyavlenskiy) of Kiev by supporters of Ukrainian autocephaly gave an especially sickening twist to the affair.²³ Afanasev enlisted in General Wrangel's army which, given the general disorder of the country, the low level of active support for the Bolsheviks and the determination of the remaining Allies to eliminate a government generally regarded as unacceptable to the concert of nations, seemed to have a reasonable chance of undoing the October Revolution until the emergence of Trotsky with his formidable organising skills as a war leader put paid to anti-Bolshevik hopes.²⁴ In 1920 Wrangel's army, including Afanasev, along with countless civilians, abandoned the Crimea for

Constantinople. But the years of soldiering had not been entirely fruitless. As Mme. Afanaseva tells us, Afanasev had found time to read literature, philosophy and theology, especially A.A. Blok, D.N. Merežkovskiy, V.V. Rozanov, Kant and Solovyev, as well as the then fashionable theosophists.²⁵ He was not wholly unprepared for geisteswissenschaftlichen Problemen in a University setting, the goal on which he had now set his heart.²⁶ If one were to select one theme from his Russian background that would form a continuing leit-motif in his ecclesiology this would surely be the issue of the relations between Church and civil society.

B. Serbia 1920-1929

In due course Afanasev found himself evacuated along with many of his exiled fellow-countrymen to the small South Slav kingdom of Serbia. The country was devoutly Orthodox, and with strong ties of sentiment binding it to Russia. At the same time, it lay a prudent distance from the Red Army, an advantage for a neighbouring Slav people, as the example of the invasion of Poland in 1920-1 was currently demonstrating. Moreover, the Allied powers were in the process of giving Serbia greatly extended territory, wealth and (it was hoped) stability by making it the nucleus of a South Slav state consisting of the former Austro-Hungarian possessions to the north and west, as well as parts of Bulgarian Macedonia to the south and incorporating the hitherto autonomous principality of Montenegro on the Albanian border. The ruling dynasty was a Serbian family of fairly recent rise to distinction, lacking the autocratic and Caesaropapist pretensions of the Romanovs. The language was close enough to

Russian to permit of moderately easy mutual understanding. Having received a bursary for the purpose, the twenty-seven year old Afanasev enrolled in the theological faculty of Belgrade University in the spring of 1921, being careful at the same time to preserve his links with the considerable Russian emigré population in the Yugoslav capital.

Into what kind of theological milieu was he entering? From a Russian's viewpoint, partly familiar, partly unfamiliar.²⁷ In the post-mediaeval period, the Serbian church had been protected by the house of Habsburg, for they had a common enemy in the Turks. The historic Serbian patriarchate of Peč had been abolished by joint action of the Ottoman government and the Phanar in 1766, in a move to bring all eparchies in the Ottoman empire under the direct control of the ecumenical patriarch (with whom it was more convenient for the Turks to treat). A new line of metropolitans in Habsburg-controlled Karlovtsy on the Danube encouraged contact with Western culture and thought and were eventually granted the title of patriarch - by the emperor Franz Joseph, in 1848. With this background, the ecclesiastical life of the Serbian church must have seemed at least a half-way house to the West. However, the influence of Russia on the Karlovtsy metropolitanate and patriarchate had necessarily been strong since its inception: nowhere else in the Slavonic world was theological, canonical and liturgical literature so readily available. The stream of books, and even teachers, from Russia to Karlovtsy began in the seventeenth century. In 1724 the Holy Synod sent a certain Maksim Svivorov to open a school there, and graduates thereof passed on to Kiev, the general run to the Kievan seminary, the more gifted to the Academy. In 1794 the metropolitan Stefan Stratimirovič opened

a seminary at Karlovtsy, adopting Russian theological works as the basis of the syllabus. Soon after the declaration of Serbian independence in 1830 the ecumenical patriarch established a new metropolitanate at Belgrade and in 1836 the metropolitan Petar persuaded the king to open a seminary there. By mid-century it was fully furnished with contemporary Russian doctrinal and apologetic texts. In the later century, the period when Russian theology was entering its most creative phase (at any rate, before the time of the post-revolutionary Diaspora), the Serbian church was taking its first tentative steps in theological writing. Just as in mediaeval Russia, its first products were translations and canonical works. At the turn of the century, Metrophanes Chevits translated the manuals of Makarii Bulgakov. The main canonist was Nikodim Milaš, bishop of Zava. A Dalmatian Serb, he grew up in an area where jurisprudence was founded on Byzantine and Roman law. His Pravoslavnotsrkveno pravo was translated into German, Russian, Bulgarian, Greek and Rumanian and has greatly influenced modern Orthodox canonists. He produced a number of collections of canonical texts, and was particularly interested in the church of North Africa in the Roman period. Milaš has a good deal to say about Church-State relations, a subject with which lesser Serbian canonists like C. Metrovič and I. Bogovič were centrally concerned.²⁸

It seems clear that Afanasev and other Russian émigré students in Belgrade would have found more continuity than discontinuity in comparing their new situation with their old. In fact, so far as Serbian dogmatic theology was concerned, nothing need be added to supplement what was said in Chapter I about the Russian theological background, for Serbian dogmatics were entirely derivative, and

usually translations, from the Russian. However, the concern with canon law seems especially characteristic of Serbian Orthodoxy in this period, perhaps because of the need to put a scattered (and sometimes persecuted) Church on a firm organisational footing. It was in 1920, the year before Afanasev's arrival in Belgrade, that the ecumenical patriarch conceded full autocephaly to a new Serbian patriarch whose throne was to be in Belgrade itself. At the same time, this interest in matters canonical must have been shared by many thoughtful Russian newcomers, bearing in mind that behind them lay the sad story of the domination of Church by tsar, the bureaucratisation of the episcopate and the problems involved in restoring patriarchal and synodal authority which have been chronicled in the preceding section of this Chapter.

Afanasev's own interests were at first essentially canonical and historical. His thesis for the University of Belgrade, published in Serbian at Skoplje in Macedonia in 1927, would be entitled 'The power of the State in the ecumenical councils'. One supposes that he also took part in theological discussion of a wider kind since he knew in Belgrade such outstanding theological figures of the Diaspora as C. Kern, S.S. Bezobrazov, V.V. Zenkovsky, and N. Zernov, whose work will be described shortly. On a visit to the Russian student circle at Olmütz in Moravia he met and was influenced by S.N. Bulgakov.²⁹ Meanwhile, however, there were other matters to attend to. In 1925 he married a Russian girl, Mariamma Nikolaevna Andrusova, a niece of the legendary archaeologist-merchant Heinrich Schliemann.³⁰ The wedding was celebrated at Prague, then the centre of a thriving Russian emigré colony and indeed of an entire Russian University in exile. But needing money to support

himself as a married man, as well as time to prepare his doctorate, Afanasev moved to Macedonia where he taught religion in a secondary school. This cannot have meant final burial in the eyes of the emigré theologians for when the founding of a Russian theological institute in the West was mooted he was offered a stipendiary lectureship, working first of all on patristic history until he was offered in 1932 the chair of Canon Law.

A word must be said at this point on the tangled question of conflicting jurisdictions within the Russian Church, a problem which was not to be resolved within Afanasev's lifetime and constitutes an important part of the background to the founding and vicissitudes of the Institut Saint-Serge.³¹ It will be remembered that after the close of the Sobor, the fortunes of the Russian Church in a time of persecution were entrusted to the metropolitan Tikhon of Moscow, as the first post-Petrine patriarch. In May 1922 Tikhon was arrested, but even before that date the confused situation necessarily attendant on persecution had deprived him of much of his authority. In the previous year, a large gathering of refugees from Russia had gathered at Sremski-Karlovtzy, the residence of the Serbian patriarch. They had not originally intended to constitute themselves a council of the Russian Church in exile, but the pressure of their situation at once led them in that direction. The monarchist majority at the council pressed for a resolution that only the House of Romanov could legitimately govern the faithful of the Church of Russia. Led by Anthony of Kiev they were successful in this, though opposed by a strong minority, whose spokesman was the metropolitan Evlogy (Georgievsky), a bishop whom Tikhon of Moscow would soon make head of all Russian

parishes in the West.³² Although the minority refused to sign, there was not as yet an open split. However, the gap between monarchist churchmen and the rest widened in the next months and years. The belief of Evlogy that the political adventuring of the council would aggravate the position of the Church within Russia was fully borne out by events.³³ After a formal condemnation by the patriarch a temporary modus vivendi was achieved by the exiles. The organs of church government instituted by the Karlovtsy council were dissolved, with the exception of the synod of bishops in exile. Evlogy agreed to accept membership of this synod and for the time being his status as bishop of the Russians in Western Europe was recognised by the rest.

In 1923 Tikhon was himself deposed by a caucus of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council, ostensibly for failing to convoke the Council in 1921, as the canons of the 1917 Sobor required. The Ecumenical Patriarch, Grigorios VII, thereupon offered to suppress the patriarchate on the grounds that its restoration had been hastily conceived and politically motivated, and proposed a new Sobor instead. Tikhon held firm, but the equivocal situation favoured the creation of largely government-inspired 'Renovationist' bodies on the fringe of the patriarchal church: the 'Living Church', the 'Union for Church Renovation', the 'Union of Communities of Ancient Apostolic Churches', and so forth.³⁴ In 1925 Tikhon died, leaving the leadership of the church to a 'guardian of the patriarchal throne', the metropolitan Peter (Polyansky) of Krutitsy, regarded by some as a Bolshevik sympathiser. But in spite of this reputation Peter was arrested the following year, and a deputy was found in Sergius (Stragorodsky)

of Nizhny-Novgorod, who had been compromised in the eyes of many by a brief flirtation with the Soviet-inspired 'Living Church'. Around the same time a document came to light, apparently from the hand of the dead patriarch, recommending the Orthodox to submit faithfully to Soviet authority, and annulling the acts of the Synod of emigré bishops. The Karlovtsy Synod bishops (who presided over what we must call from now on the 'synodal church') declared this document apocryphal but for a time Anthony withdrew recognition from the metropolitan Peter, only accepting him again after strong pressure was brought to bear from within the Diaspora. After Peter's death, Anthony broke off relations with Moscow entirely, declaring that the sole inheritor of the spiritual tradition of the old Orthodox Church of Russia was now the synodal church. He and his supporters proposed to give this hierarchy in exile complete autonomy by the election of an independent patriarch - which naturally enough they believed should be Anthony. At this point, Evlogy, who was now residing regularly in Paris, could follow him no longer, although his own relations with Moscow were becoming strained owing to what was seen as Sergius' excessive compliance with the Soviet regime. The years 1926-7 saw a series of rifts within the ancient body of Russian Orthodoxy. First of all, Sergius' ordering of prayers for the Soviet government and his disclaimer, made to foreign journalists, that there was any religious persecution in the U.S.S.R., led to a cessation of relations with Evlogy. Evlogy took the initiative the better to combat the claims of Anthony in Belgrade. The rest of the Karlovtsy bishops, themselves no longer recognising Sergius, took steps to curtail the jurisdiction of Evlogy in Paris by hiving off the Russian parishes in Germany

to form a new diocese. When Evlogy refused to accept this move, they suspended him, an act he regarded as lacking in canonical force since his appointment had been made on patriarchal authority. When the majority of the Russian faithful in Paris had made clear their intention of staying on his side, the Synodal bishops sent one of their number, the metropolitan Seraphim, to the French capital to organise a rival Russian church there. Evlogy would evidently have been quite isolated had not the new Ecumenical Patriarch, Vasilios III, taken his view of things. He declared that Russian bishops who had fled from their dioceses and were living as guests of the Serbian Patriarch had no canonical right to convoke a Council, much less to deprive a duly appointed exarch of his ministry. Evlogy's policies had been pastorally sound but church-politically somewhat exposed. 1931 saw the perfect solution. Aggravated beyond all bearing by the increasingly subservient tone of the locum tenens of the patriarchal throne in all matters concerning the Soviet State, a diocesan conference supported Evlogy's judgment that the best course would be to accept for the time being the direct jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch - until such time as a relaxation of political dictatorship in Russia might give the patriarchal throne its freedom again.³⁵ In February of that year, the Ecumenical Patriarch, Photios II, accepted Evlogy as exarch of Western Europe. This would be henceforth the church context in which Afanasev's teaching, writing and ministry would be pursued. If Afanasev's Serbian experience be considered in terms of its lasting results for his ecclesiology, the dominant theme would undoubtedly be that of the jurisdictional conflicts in which the Russian church of the Diaspora was caught up, with

their disastrous consequences for the primitive Christian ideal of a single Eucharist and bishop in each local church.

C. France 1929-1966

Afanasev's move, by stages, from Yugoslavia to France was determined by the efforts of the metropolitan Evlogy to establish a Russian Orthodox theological institute in Paris.³⁶ By the end of 1918 all theological schools of whatever grade had been forcibly closed in Russia itself. Of the million émigrés in the Diaspora three-quarters are believed to have had at least secondary education. A very large number were graduates. In fact, an inordinately large proportion of the old intelligentsia left the country, so much so that one historian can speak of the Diaspora of the early 1920's as 'a living embodiment of the cultural life of the Russia of the Tsars'.³⁷ The question was, if the theological life of the pre-revolutionary Russian Church was to be resumed, how could these rich but scattered human resources best be tapped? The exiles were not so widely scattered as might be thought. They tended to apian concentrations. In 1923, largely because of the worsening economic climate in Germany, their principal hive switched from Berlin to Paris. In a short time, the cathedral church of bishop Evlogy on the Rue Daru was too small and the search was on for a second centre. A chapel with attendant buildings, formerly the property of a German Lutheran congregation, was found, and bought with the assistance of a Jewish friend of the metropolitan. Its possibilities for the wider scheme of a house of theology were at once apparent to Evlogy. Acquired by auction on the feast of St. Sergius of Radonezh (18 July) 1924,

it was consecrated to the great Russian monastic founder's patronage six months later. The bishop's address on this occasion admirably captures the spirit of the new institution whose staff Afanasev was to join two years later. 'Remember', he told the congregation,

what a significant part of the means for this holy enterprise was given by foreigners. We must show them the beauty of Orthodoxy. May this church be a place of brotherly intercommunion and the rapprochement of all Christians... Here prayer shall be unceasing, not only for all Russian peoples labouring and heavy-laden, at home and scattered abroad in the sorrow of exile, but for the peace of the whole world, for the welfare of God's holy churches, and for the union of them all.³⁸

Parish organisation followed closely the laws laid down by the Sobor of 1917-18, while the disposition of the church and the Liturgy were made as classical as possible. Thanks to the generosity of the Grand Duchess Maria Pavlovna, the iconostasis and other interior décor were created by the noted Russian artist D.S. Steletsky, in the pure style of sixteenth century Russian icon-painting. The liturgical rites were distinguished by their strict observance of classic forms, and the choir confined itself to the more traditional sixteenth century music, in place of the concert style so prevalent in Russia at the turn of the century. The jewel which this liturgical setting was to house, however, was a theological academy and for this purpose Evlogy brought together, so far as was humanly possible, the best teachers he could find among the Russian Orthodox diaspora, not only in Paris but also in Berlin, Prague, Belgrade, Sofia and elsewhere. On 30 April 1925 the college was formally opened as 'Institut de Théologie orthodoxe de Paris'. The professorial body, who



must be regarded as providing the primary intellectual milieu for Afanasev, since the remaining forty-two years of his life, with one interval only, would be spent teaching within its walls, included some celebrated names. A.V. Kartashev, the former minister of cults in Kerensky's ill-fated Government, and some time professor of Russian Church history in the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, taught, inter alia, Church history. S.S. Bezobrazoff, later raised to the episcopate as Bishop Cassian and appointed Rector in 1954, also a former member of staff at St. Petersburg, presided over New Testament studies.³⁹ Father Sergei Bulgakov taught dogmatic theology.⁴⁰ V.V. Zenkovsky, formerly docent in the University of Kiev, lectured in apologetics and philosophy.⁴¹ George Florovsky,⁴² L.A. Zander,⁴³ Pavel Evdokimov,⁴⁴ V. Lossky,⁴⁵ Cyprian Kern,⁴⁶ J.F. Meyendorff,⁴⁷ C.V. Motchultsky⁴⁸ and V.V. Weidle⁴⁹ were other full-time teachers added during the summer-time of Afanasev's own professorship at St.-Serge. Enjoying occasional lectures also from such men as N.A. Berdyaev,⁵⁰ S.L. Frank⁵¹ and N.O. Lossky,⁵² the Institute could boast a veritable gallery of talented figures, so much so that until the re-opening of the Moscow theological academy in 1944 it was the undisputed leader of Russian theology, the only Russian theological academy of University level in the world, and certainly the first completely free institute of theology in the history of the Russian church.⁵³

Afanasev arrived at Saint-Serge in 1930. He spent the 1930's teaching as a married layman, but on the outbreak of the Second World War began preparing to receive Orders. The metropolitan Evlogy gave him the diaconate on 25 December 1939 and the presbyterate the following day which in the Julian calendar

was kept as the Synaxis of the Mother of God. The 1930's, so it would prove, were the halcyon days of Saint-Serge. Its ecumenical involvement was a marked feature of life there from 1937 onwards. As the historian of the Institute remarks, it was the professors of Saint-Serge who carried the major responsibility for Orthodox participation in the ecumenical movement as that was understood from the Edinburgh 'Faith and Order' conference of August 1937 on. The fact that their autonomous status as an independent house of theology under the protection of an enlightened exarch made ecumenical openness easier than it would have been for representatives of more solidly established national churches does not greatly diminish their honour.⁵⁴ During this period Afanasev published a number of articles on ecclesiological issues, notably the controversial 'Dve idei vselenskoï Tserkvi' of 1934, as well as investigations into the theological status of canon law. The German invasion of France found him on holiday on the Côte d'Azur, and rather than trying to return to the war zone he went to Tunis, then an overseas département of the Third French Republic and, assisted by his wife, saw to the spiritual needs of the Orthodox community there for the duration of the War. Chiefly Tsarist naval officers attached to the Karlovtsy jurisdiction, these émigré families turned for help to Evlogy's suffragan in Nice, bishop Vladimir Tichonicky, who was able to commend them to Afanasev. Even in a world war - and Tunis suffered blockade and bombardment from 8 November 1942 to 7 June 1943 - life goes on, and these war years saw in fact the gestation of a number of great books from Saint-Serge theologians. These would include Afanasev's own Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo.

This book, according to Afanasev's widow, was the fruition of long years of meditation on a visionary glimpse of 'eucharistic ecclesiology' which came to her husband in the winter of 1932-3.⁵⁵ Although the two leading Russian Orthodox minds in Paris, Nicolas Berdyaev and Sergei Bulgakov, had reservations about Afanasev's basic intuition, they agreed to give it an airing in Berdyaev's journal Put soon afterwards. Meanwhile Afanasev was deepening his patristic knowledge, which is most fully revealed in an unpublished essay on the Syrian father Ibas of Edessa whose Antiochene Christology earned him the rebuke of Justinian's Council of Constantinople in the condemnation of the 'Three Chapters'. The interest in the inter-relation of Church and State, drawn directly from the Russian background, is now complemented by a richer doctrinal awareness. Although Afanasev could not be called either a systematic or a speculative theologian, ecclesiology is becoming truly theology: reflection on the Church is becoming a locus for reflection on the mystery of God himself, the everlasting Source of her existence, as is made plain by the very title of his book, 'The Church of the Holy Spirit'. Mme. Afanaseva stressed that the lignes maitresses of that book were laid down in Africa, with little more than a copy of the Bible and the liturgical books of the Russian rite to hand. Its patristic apparatus must have been added later. Finally, its re-working after the war owing something to Afanasev's reading of Gregory Dix's masterpiece, The Shape of the Liturgy, to which he had been introduced by his pupil Alexander Schmemmann.⁵⁶

The post-war years saw more articles, as well as the short study of the Eucharist entitled Trapeza Gospodnya. Increasingly, Afanasev's attention turned towards the problem of the

relationship between Orthodoxy and the Roman Catholic Church among whose faithful he was living.⁵⁷ The publication of Oscar Cullmann's Saint Pierre, Disciple, apôtre, martyr in 1952 launched Afanasev on a new trajectory which would carry him to his 1960 essay 'L'Eglise qui préside dans l'Amour'. This study of the role of the Roman church amid the communion of all the churches enjoyed wide acclaim, not only in Orthodoxy. It achieved a mention in the nota praevia to the draft 'De Ecclesia' of the Second Vatican Council, and may be said to have influenced significantly the ecclesiology of that Council's documents.⁵⁸ Though Afanasev viewed with disfavour some of the developments in the doctrine of the Church at the Council, the concept of episcopal collegiality being diametrically opposed to the main thrust of his own programme, he welcomed with great joy the invitation to become an official observer at its final session. With much emotion he assisted at the mutual raising of the anathemas of 1054 which cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, as papal legate, and the Byzantine patriarch Michael Kerullarios had pronounced on each other, and each other's supporters.⁵⁹ In the autumn of 1966 he was present at another celebration which looked back to the 'undivided Church', to an age when East and West sat together at the same eucharistic Table. This was the millennial celebrations of the shrine of Mont Saint-Michel in Normandy, an honouring of the angel guardian of Orthodox and Catholics alike. Never in the best of health he fell ill in the winter. He died on 4 December 1966, the feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and was buried four days afterwards in the Russian cemetery at Sainte Geneviève des Bois. Père Christophe Dumont of the Order of Preachers represented the cardinal archbishop of Paris, while telegrams

of condolence were received from the cardinal Secretary of State on behalf of pope Paul VI, and from cardinal Augustin Bea, president of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, as well as from Reformed churchmen and a great number of Orthodox autocephalies and faculties of theology.⁶⁰ Such testimonies were only proper: for the lesson Afanasev had learnt well in his French exile was that of the ecumenical imperative: the ut unum sint of the final testament of Christ.

Afanasev recognised that, while a Christian mind cannot embrace historical positivism, no Christian historian can be understood save in terms of the meanings caught in the net of circumstance. In the Preface to L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit, published by his widow, he had written:

L'historien ne vit pas en dehors du temps, surtout s'il est historien de l'Eglise. Si son travail est une oeuvre ecclésiale, il doit servir l'Eglise. Ne doit-il pas alors rappeler dans ses oeuvres que l'Eglise possède ses propres principes; qu'elle n'est pas une organisation humaine, mais une institution divine; que c'est la volonté de Dieu qui agit en elle par le canal de l'Esprit, et non la volonté humaine; qu'elle vit et agit à l'aide des dons de l'Esprit que Dieu ne mesure pas; que 'nous sommes citoyens des cieux; et c'est de là que nous attendons notre Sauveur, le Seigneur Jésus Christ' ... que l'Eglise est 'l'Eglise de l'Esprit Saint', et que, tout en étant dans le siècle, elle appartient 'au commencement des derniers jours'....⁶¹

The phrase put him in mind, it seems, of the Pentecost sermon of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, which he proceeds to quote. The Lucan passage ends, '(On that day) all who call upon the name of the Lord will be saved'.⁶² He wrote after this, originally in Russian and in Greek, the words 'The Name of the Lord Jesus

Christ', remembering surely the Orthodox prayer of the Name of Jesus in that traditionally pious household in Odessa where this story began.

Chapter III The main monuments of Afanasev's ecclesiology:

I The inter-war years

A considerable portion of Afanasev's output is unpublished. Some of his work was privately printed, before or after his death, for circulation among colleagues, students and a wider circle of contacts at the Institut Saint-Serge. Other material, much of it simply lecture notes, exists in typescript or manuscript form in the Afanasev archive there. An inventory of this unpublished writing will be found in Appendix B as part of a comprehensive Afanasev bibliography. Yet his published work, and notably its main monuments, is sufficiently copious to enable an exposition of his thinking about the Church. That work falls naturally into seven principal divisions. Looking at each in turn will take us from the student of early Christian history in the Serbia of the 1920's to the herald of a new Orthodox vision of the Papacy in the years immediately preceding the Second Vatican Council.

A. Studies of the Councils (1927-1932)

Afanasev's earliest publications deal with the conciliar institution.¹ That Afanasev's entree into theology was by way of historical investigation of the early Councils is a vital but strangely neglected clue in the understanding of his thought. His studies of the councils share two related themes: the relationship of council to emperor, and the nature of conciliar authority.

1. Council and emperor

Afanasev points out that the ecumenical councils were called isključivo, 'exclusively', by the Roman emperors and their Byzantine heirs: as an Orthodox he speaks, of course, of what in Catholic usage would be termed the first seven Councils.² The decision as to whether the turn of events warranted a council was the emperor's alone, and neither pope nor patriarch could deflect it. The fact rises to the eye in such instances as the correspondence of Leo the Great with Theodosius II over the Ephesus council of 449, or Leo's negotiations with his admirer Marcian over the siting and timing of what became the council of Chalcedon.³ Towards the end of the conciliar period, the Iconoclast council of 754 claimed explicitly to be both ecumenical and imperially convoked.⁴ Naturally, the determinative rôle of the imperial will does not mean that such councils were called arbitrarily and bez razloga, 'without reason'. Only some already existing public ecclesiastical debate, in which the episcopate necessarily played a large part, could rouse an emperor to the summoning of a council. Yet while historical research can illuminate the variety of ways in which the relation between Church and emperor were realised, it also points up the dependence of the conciliar institution on the imperial power. Imperial letters, referred to by Eusebius in connection with the first council of Nicaea as timētika grammata, formed the essential instrument of convocation.⁵ Those of the 431 Ephesus council open by observing that the good estate of the polis depends upon the quality of its reverence for God and the 'truth

of piety', indicating the common concerns that link empire and Church together. The emperors inferred that, precisely as rulers, their task included the preservation of the Church's peace, necessary for the execution of her worship and the expansion of her mission. To meet the 'needs of the times', the Ephesian letters of convocation call bishops from all over the oikoumenē so that they may 'study these important questions'. While the actual cause of convocation is not further specified, the council's location, timing and membership are laid down.⁶ Such terms are paralleled in Marcian's convocation of Chalcedon twenty years later. Afanasev stresses that conciliar letters of convocation fail to indicate a special role for the Roman pope in the making of councils. We cannot suppose that he gave explicit pristanak, 'consent', to their calling. An apparent argument to the contrary, Marcian's negotiations with pope Leo, belong to the altogether exceptional situation which followed on the 449 Latrocinium and so cannot be regarded as typical.⁷ Afanasev admits, however, that by the time of the third Council of Constantinople a shift had occurred in the relations of emperor and Church. The weakening of the East Roman state with the loss of its richest Oriental territories in the Arab invasions and its failure to sustain Justinian's reconquest of the West coincided with the consolidation of the patriarchal system. But though the Byzantine patriarch would have more influence in the matter of councils than previously, this was not so much revolution as reform of the technicalities. For the Byzantine patriarch could be expected to share the mind of his emperor. Judging from the correspondence of Constantine IV and Eirene about the third council of Constantinople and the

second council of Nicaea respectively, the imperial sacrum was as operative as ever.⁸

Turning from the convocation of councils to their membership, Afanasev finds the hand of the emperor (or empress) at every turn. The first and second ecumenical councils were characterised by a considerable turn-out of private persons: lower clergy, monks, bishops expelled from their sees, a whole army of gledaotsi, 'observers', who disturbed or even terrorised the conciliar meetings. Understandably, therefore, Theodosius II took steps before Ephesus to remove from the environs of the conciliar aula any unauthorised persons, whether clerical or lay, difficult though it was to exclude those who came in the train of bona fide bishops. On the other hand, the presence of the 'invited' members was strictly obavezno, 'of (civil) obligation'. Attendance was a serious duty, binding even when it might entail loss of income or danger to life. If a council were to be effective, this owed much to the odnos i utitsai, 'connections and influence', enjoyed by the imperial officeholder at the time.⁹ As to the essential membership, the tradition was already well-established in the ante-Nicene period that this was episcopal. According to Afanasev, the origins of this tradition lay in the authority borne by the presidents of local churches at a time when bishops were elected. The emperors implicitly recognised this fact in that they permitted any bishop, and not just the Roman pope, to be represented by a legate if need arose. The imperial freedom in regard to conciliar membership was manifested in their willingness to sift potential episcopal members. Thus the emperors might despatch personal invitations to bishops they especially

respected, as when Theodosius II invited Augustine to Ephesus. Or again, they might take steps to exclude bishops they particularly disliked, as when the same ruler prevented Theodoret of Cyr from attending the councils of his reign. Yet though, with these provisos, the emperors adhered to the ante-Nicene practice, they by no means considered themselves wholly bound by it. They felt able to enlarge the composition of councils if circumstances warranted the change. At the moment when the threat of Monophysite schism hung most heavily, the emperors realised the importance of the monastic movement, and included its representatives in the process of conciliar decision-making. The prestige of the monks grew subsequently with their part in the defence of images: at the 787 Iconophile council they are found not only assisting but actively debating, assenting to various suggested formulae and finally signing the council's resolutions just like its episcopal members.¹⁰

Such rights vis-à-vis councils presupposed not only the divine character of temporal authority but also an orthodox ecclesial consciousness on the part of the emperors. Ideally, once innovative and presumptively heterodox teaching surfaced, the emperor was to seek a saglanosti, 'consensus', in the opětím mišlieniem, 'general opinion', of the Church as to the sazrela potreba, 'ripeness of the need', for a council. This achieved, the emperor should then sit back, confining any further efforts to the technical side of conciliar organisation. But in practice, whether through unawareness of the complexity of the dogmatic issues, or partisanship in favour of heretical positions or by dint of frankly political considerations, the emperors intervened actively in doctrinal issues. If a heretical

group of bishops gained the emperor's ear this might lead to the imperial proclamation of their teaching as orthodoxy, as happened in the cases of Monothelitism and Iconoclasm. Precisely because, when a council was called in such circumstances, the episcopate at large was likely to regain the initiative, the emperors became even more anxious to secure the victory of the party they favoured. By availing themselves of their powers, they could strengthen the party of their choice, as at the Latrocinium and at Constantine V's Iconoclast council. Yet Afanasev confesses that, even so, the emperors could not count on votes, especially where the suffragans of a metropolitan were concerned.¹¹

Potentially, imperial interference affected the entire time-span of a council, beginning with its preparation. In patriarchal and metropolitical centres, conciliar preparation often took the form of konferencijama, 'conferences', amounting at times to regional councils. The best-known examples are the Roman synods held prior to the despatch of papal legates to ecumenical councils held in the East. But preparations no less intensive took place in New Rome as well. Justinian's letter to the second council of Constantinople reflects considerable research into the texts of earlier theologians and councils, while the erudition marshalled by the conciliar assemblies of the Iconoclast crisis suggests the work of commissions rather than individuals. But Afanasev implicitly admits that much of the preparatory discussion may well have been episcopal, not imperial, in origin, and explicitly confesses that it is impossible to know how much took place in an unpremeditated way. Nevertheless, he insists that the emperor's right to arrange pre-conciliar commissions to survey the matters on the

council's agenda must be regarded as a potent instrument in his hands.¹²

Even more striking was the rôle of the emperor or his representative at the councils themselves. The emperors attended all seven ecumenical councils with the exception of the third and fifth. Ultimately, their direct participation must be explained by the epoch-making refusal of Constantine the Great to renounce his starih neznabožacnih prava i privilegija, 'ancient pagan rights and privileges'. Though he showed no especial respect for Church authority, the Church allowed Constantine to regard himself as ho episkopos tōn exō, the guardian of her public life. The emperor's presence at councils was part and parcel of this wider whole. In line with his general guardianship of the Church, his conciliar rôle was to safeguard the order of a council and the safety of its members. Afanasev gives full credence to courteous episcopal pleas for the emperor's attendance while fully accepting that it was in the imperial interest to influence Church settlements in an age when theological divergence could mean revolutionary unrest. In this way, and reverting to his opening motif, Afanasev considers that the imperial right to convene a council entailed in effect a power to determine its programme of work, even though for much of the time such a programme could only reflect the concerns of the hour among the plebs Dei.¹³

All in all, therefore, the Constantinian revolution in Church-State relations transformed the nature of the council which had been, in an earlier epoch, čisto tserkovnim institutom, 'a purely ecclesial institution'. Though for the Nicene bishops, the hand of Constantine was the instrument whereby the blessed God had

destroyed idolatry, Constantine in reality simply extended to Christianity the 'pontifical' patronage the emperors had traditionally extended to the old Roman religion - while at the same time following a policy of toleration towards the other religions of the empire.¹⁴

But how was the imperial transformation of the ante-Nicene council possible? Afanasev remarks how surprising the historian must at first sight find it that the Church, without any visible sign of internal dissent, accepted as guide for all its 'external' activities that very authority which it had so valiantly resisted during several periods of severe persecution. What is the explanation? Not a moral collapse, some postulated servilism, 'servility', on the part of the bishops. They were perfectly capable of resisting emperors on doctrinal issues, as Constantine and Constantius discovered. Instead, Afanasev proposes that by seeking and accepting juridical recognition, Churchmen realised that they must take the consequences, namely, submission to the laws regulating the religiones licitae. Referring wryly to the Dukhovnii Reglament imposed by Peter the Great on the Russian church, Afanasev remarks that many centuries before the Great Church had bowed to another 'spiritual regulation' with even more far-reaching results.¹⁵

For Constantine and his successors, councils were utilities. Constantine adapted himself so easily to the conciliar form because that form was by no means a Christian preserve. It was a widespread feature of the classical world, and the emperor cult itself had connexions with both the Greek koine and the Roman provincial concilia. Constantine took advantage of the formal similarities between the Christian council and its pagan

counterparts to import into the former attitudes characteristic of the latter. The Church, though perfectly aware of the existence of the imperial cultus and its significance for conciliar institutions, overlooked the disadvantages for the sake of the privileges which its own conciliar assemblies would henceforth receive. However, Afanasev is careful to issue a caveat here. He is not concerned with the genesis of the Christian council in its relationship to the pagan council, but with the presence of comparable juridical factors in both. Because of the diffusion of particular legal categories in ancient society, analogous processes took place in the formation of quite distinct institutions.

For, so far from being secular entities, the pagan councils presupposed a basic societal structure that was essentially religious, inculcating respect for and worship of the gods. Though the goroda-gosudarstva, the polis, civitas or 'city-state', was superseded in the Hellenistic period by larger political units, these preserved features of their more compact predecessors.¹⁶ In the age of the Roman conquest of the Hellenic area, federal groups like the amphictyonic leagues with their common sanctuaries, were a commonplace in Greece, the islands, and Western Asia, and they based their administrative arrangements on the ekklēsia, 'assembly', with its boulē, 'council'. The remit of these bodies must have been in part religious, since otherwise the development of the succeeding koina of the period after the Roman conquest is quite inexplicable. Indeed, immediately after that conquest they appear to have been for a while purely religious societies, since the Romans placed an interdict on their political rôle. Ironically, however, the

ousting of local gods in favour of the cultus of the emperor's genius gave them a renewed political and social importance. But, as is well-known, the emperor cult was primarily Oriental. Remotely Egyptian, proximately Hellenistic, its diffusion in the Western portion of the Roman empire was slow and superficial. Thus the Latin equivalent of the koina, the concilia provincialia of Gaul, Spain and North Africa are not so much organic growths, like the koina, but imperial creations.

The conclusion of Afanasev's account of the story of the pagan Greco-Roman council is that an institution which grew by a natural process from deep historical roots was gradually subjected to a uniformity by the emperors. The emperors defined the councils' regulations, composition, times of meeting and competence, and with that their relation to the imperial power itself. He underlines the remarkable analogy with the Christian councils of the Constantinian era and beyond:

Daže poverkhnostoe sravnenie otnošeniya vlasti k consilia i k khristianskim soboram etoi epokhi obnaruzhivaet porazitelnoe skhodstvo.¹⁷

From the historian's viewpoint, the vital clue to such 'similarities' lies in the recognition that the Roman empire, like its Byzantine continuation, knew no purely religious questions. A council had to meet not only the Church's needs but those of the State as well. Just as a concilium extraordinarium had to be summoned by, at the least, an imperial officer of prefectorial rank, so the Christian councils were summoned and overseen by the emperors themselves. The lack of a right to speak during the conciliar session did not undermine, but rather confirmed, the imperial rôle. In their own sphere, the councils were viššim gosudarstvennim

organom imperskago upravleniya, 'a higher organ of imperial rule.'¹⁸

Restricted as they are to the first seven councils the Orthodox are, Afanasev alleges, in a better position than Catholics to see that the ecumenical councils were originally an imperskii gosudarstvenno-tserkovnii institut, an 'imperial political-ecclesial institution'. He stresses that the emergence of this institution was justified and even necessitated by the totality of conditions affecting the Church at the promulgation of the Edict of Milan. Yet the result was the drawing of a sharp borderline between the councils that preceded the legalisation of Christianity and those that followed it. It may be asserted that, compared with, say, the Antiochene councils of 267 and 268, the novel features in the council of Nicaea did not affect the conciliar organism at the deepest level of its being. But no one can deny that the emperors had established noviya formalniya usloviya avtoritetnosti sobora i ego pravomošćnosti, 'new formal conditions for conciliar authority and legitimacy'.¹⁹

ii. The nature of conciliar authority

A council's agenda was not necessarily exhausted by some major doctrinal problem. After the settling of such an exalted issue, any matter affecting the interests of the Church or the lives of clergy and laity could in principle be discussed: hetera tina, anankaia gumnazesthai kai tupousthai.²⁰ But decisions on such ancillary matters did not belong to the same level as dogmatic formulations. Canonical questions are confined to a time-bound historical epoch, whereas doctrinal

definition, so Afanasev maintains, is in some sense вне времени, 'outside time', being concerned with absolute truths admitting neither alteration nor restriction. It is because he considers such time-transcending truths as bound up with what he has just described as a 'mixed' temporal-spiritual institution that Afanasev is faced with a considerable problem of theological interpretation.

In one sense, the historian can describe how doctrinal decisions were reached. Whereas in the koine and concilia provincialia decisions were made by majority vote, things were not quite so straightforward in the councils of the Church. Of course, a council did have a majority and a minority. But the members faced the challenge of discerning at what point the exchange of opinions and arguments amounted to a verdict on some thesis. The elements of truth in the minority position were supposed to be combined with those found among the majority, even though once the die was cast the minority could not cling to their original view. Orthodoxy so formulated was deemed to be divine truth and hence mandatory for the entire Church. And yet, Afanasev insists, and donning now the cap of the theologian, the object of dogmatic faith and possessor of dogmatic certitude is not the conciliar decision in and for itself, but the truth of faith made known at the council in abundance. He distinguishes the 'empirical' from the 'mystical' side of the council's reality.

Sobor ne tolko empiričeskoe ukhreždenie, no i
mističeski blagodatnii organizm.²¹

In the patristic period, the only way men knew to protect the mystical aspect of the council, the disclosure of a time-

transcending truth, was to keep inviolate the council's empirical side. Hence, though the imperial convocation of councils was an exercise of the ruler's 'sacred' authority it was expressly limited by one vital condition. A council should come to its decisions through the free expression of opinion. For, as Afanasev explains, were the council granted such freedom, the answers to dogmatic crucis should come of themselves.

The council's task was not to discover or ascertain orthodoxy as it were for the first time but to articulate what was already, in Afanasev's Serbian term, potencijalno, 'potentially there' in the Church's teaching activity. A council's primary dogmatic task was negative: to cut back irregular developments in doctrine. Only secondarily, and by way of consequence, did it take upon itself the formulation of orthodoxy. No question could be discussed in council, Afanasev assures us, unless its proper answer had already found a home in the Church's consciousness, and the contradictory of that answer had already been perceived as damaging to the integrity of the Church's proclamation. Whatever is in the svet, 'awareness', of the individual representatives of the churches must be in the awareness of those churches themselves. The council's role is declarative, not constitutive.²²

Though Afanasev's account of the conciliar definition of doctrine is closer to that of J.B. Bossuet than to that of J.H. Newman, he will not allow, unlike the Gallican author, that there can be any institutional test of what constitutes an authority-bearing council. The union of the 'empirical' and 'mystical' elements in a council cannot be expressed in institutional terms: in other words, there are no necessary

and sufficient conditions for ecumenicity which can be laid down in advance. He reminds us of a strong candidate: a council, to be ecumenical, must include representatives of all the churches or, at any rate, of all the principal churches. Yet it is notorious that not all churches were represented at the ecumenical councils, and while it is difficult to imagine that an ecumenical council would not include delegates of the chief churches, ecumenicity has never been decided in virtue of numbers alone. A second possible condition Afanasev considers is that, to be truly ecumenical, a council must be summoned as such and regard itself as such. Yet councils have met and declared themselves ecumenical while not being so recognised by the later Church. Afanasev concludes that the ultimate forum for deciding whether a council's značenie, 'meaning', was ecumenical is not that council itself. No matter how many bishops attend, no matter how solemn a council's declaration of its own ecumenicity there is no built-in guarantee that it will justify the formula of Acts 15, 28: 'Edoxen gar tō pneumati tō hagiō kai hēmin'. It may seem good 'to us' but to discover whether it seemed good to the Holy Spirit requires podtverzheniya vsei tserkvi, 'the confirmation of the whole Church'.²³

Even after a council has completed its task in freedom, there remains the apostolic rule laid down in I John 4,1: 'dokimazate ta pneumata ei ek tou theou estin'. After a council comes prinvatnie, 'reception', and usvoenie, 'assimilation', of its decisions. These entail an evaluation not only of the council's inner freedom but of its success in formulating doctrinal determinations y polnem soglasii so Sviatym Pisaniem i Predaniem, 'in full accord with Holy Scripture and Tradition'.

The process of reception comprised various moments. In the first place, a conciliar decree required the consent of the basileus as praecipuus membra Ecclesiae. Thus in the formula of recognition signed by Constantine IV at the third council of Constantinople, the emperor 'anagnōmen kai sunēnesamen' the council's teaching.²⁴ But such imperial reception did not of itself settle the status of a council, except from the viewpoint of the civil law. A conciliar decision had also to be received by the churches, their clergy and laity. It was natural that such wider ecclesial reception should find expression through the bishops as predstavitel'ami, 'those who represented' the local churches. Insofar as the episcopate was physically present at a council, such reception might be said to take place in its actual proceedings. But insofar as it was absent, each church and its hierarch had to be informed. The greater the authority of a given church and bishop the more vital their consent. And in this respect special importance was attached to the consent of the bishop of Rome. Afanasev maintains that this process of ecclesial reception was not juridical in character. A church did not pass judgment on the decisions of a putative ecumenical council so much as acknowledge truth itself. A council in itself had no authority, theologically considered, for a local church. That church could only be bound by the truth. In this way Afanasev explains the curious circumstance that a council convened as ecumenical may be rejected by the churches as inauthentic, whilst the resolutions of a merely regional council may be received as authentic and so acquire a universal value.²⁵

Afanasev ascribes the special role of the Roman church and

bishop in this priznanie istini to three factors: its relative independence of the imperial power, the extensiveness of the peoples and territories within its pastoral care, and the purity of its dogmatic tradition. He does not discuss, therefore, either the main factor commonly stressed by Catholic writers, namely the apostolic foundation of the Roman church, nor that generally emphasised by Orthodox commentators, the importance of Old Rome as the capital of empire. Admitting that, whatever its causes, a paramount moral and religious authority was given to the Roman see, Afanasev mentions in somewhat guarded terms a factor which may explain the peculiar prominence of papal moment in reception. By custom, the pope was not personally present at the councils, sending representatives instead. Because of this he gave his consent v otdelnom porvadke posle sobora, 'in separate fashion after the council'. Thus the pope's claim to ratify conciliar decisions as a necessary condition of their validity did not necessarily place him in a different position from the other patriarchs.²⁶

Afanasev distances himself as fully as possible from what he takes to be the Catholic view of conciliar ecumenicity. In Catholicism, the demand that a council's teaching shall be received by all is imposed papskoi vlasti, 'by papal authority'. Whereas for Orthodoxy an ecumenical council is visšee viraženie sobornosti, 'a higher expression of sobornost', for Catholicism it is tserkovnii institut, 'an ecclesiastical institution', whose decisions, once confirmed by the Roman pope, are accepted as a 'matter of disciplinary order', v porvadke distsiplinarnom. They are not received pokornost istine, by 'obedience to the truth', but by submission to papal power. In the Orthodox case,

the truth is received iznutri, from within. In the Catholic case it comes izvne, 'from without', and so remains ynutrenne čuždoi, 'internally alien'. Moreover, the Orthodox cannot accept that nositel istinnago tserkovnago soznaniya, 'the bearer of the truth of ecclesial consciousness' can be simply člen tserkvi, 'a member of the Church'. Grasp of the Church's mind is achieved not through appeal to an institutional norm but through sobornost, that is čerez obščee i svobodnoe priyatie istine vsem tserkovnim organizmom, 'through a common and free reception of the truth in the entire ecclesial organism'. Afanasev concludes that the ecumenical character of a council can only be determined when the process of reception has come to its term. He speaks of an indescribable ynutrennii tainstvenni forum, an 'interior, mysterious forum' which escapes all rules and norms, just as truth itself exceeds formulae and epistemological criteria:

Edinstvennii kriterium istini zaključaetsya samoi istine ili točnee, istina ne trebuet nikakogo kriteriuma.

Faced with the question, Is such-and-such a council ecumenical, Orthodoxy can only answer: that council is ecumenical which discloses the truth and is received by the entire Church.²⁷

Afanasev is at some pains, especially in the later of these essays, to assure his readers that he is not dismissing the visible conciliar institution out of hand. Whatever one thinks of the origins of the ecumenical councils - and he has made it clear that, precisely as ecumenical, they are for him an imperial creation, the Church has known no higher authority in its own life. So much the historian can and must say. But though the outer sign has its importance in the economy of salvation,

to the theologian it carries only a 'relative significance', otnositelnoe značenie. Some allege that the will to hold a general council has become enfeebled in Orthodoxy, but the fact is that, as a Roman-Byzantine institution, the ecumenical council belongs to a unique, and now finished, historical period. The attempt to realise ideal ... svyaščennoi imperii, 'the ideal of a holy empire', is dead. A future council could not have, in the strict sense, an ecumenical impact for the simple reason that there is no longer an oikoumenē. On the other hand, so long as there remain in the Orthodox world ties of one kind or another between Church and State only too many opportunities remain for temporal rulers to lean on the representatives of territorial churches.²⁸ He gives the impression that this problem concerns him more deeply than the question of a possible future general council. In new kulturno-istoričeskiya uslovija, 'cultural and historical conditions' we cannot imagine what form the outer construction of such a council might take. Yet if the possibility emerges, the Church will see to it that appropriate forms are worked out.²⁹

B. A theology of canon law (1933-1936)

Afanasev's investigations of the Councils had convinced him that not everything in the concrete life of the Church derives from the grace of the Gospel. The realisation that alien, though not necessarily maleficent, features had joined in symbiosis with the original ecclesial tradition led him to distinguish between the empirical and transcendent or 'mystical' elements in the Councils. An obvious next step was to explore

the nature of canon law and the implications of its historically shifting character.³⁰

1. The nature of canon law

Afanasev points out that in periods when the Church's life flows on without significant interruption there is a tendency to think of existing forms as immutable. In such epochs, kanoničeskoe sobranie, 'canonical consciousness', finds expression in a sense of total continuity: the content of existing forms is considered to be, eo ipso, canonical. But this Elysian state of mind cannot survive periods when the waters of the Church's life are troubled, and the forms of her concrete being begin to mutate. In such times, the attitude for which everything that exists is canonical is replaced by a new mind-set in which the canonical is whatever corresponds to the canons. But closer inspection shows that the canons are not self-interpreting but demand for the purposes of judgment some viššago kriteriuma, 'higher criterion', in whose light they may do their work. This is why, for Afanasev, a theological assessment of the foundations of canon law is vital. To resolve canonical problems one must understand not only the canonical apparatus but also what the concept of 'the canonical' signifies for the Church. One must think it through theologically, and this means in the light of the eternal.

In the Church's life, historical development has moved in multiple directions, and cannot simply be described as an expansion of the original donnée révélée. One need only compare, Afanasev remarks, the characteristic regimen of the earliest

communities with the church organisation of the fourth and fifth centuries; or the little, juridically autonomous communities of the second century with the age when the great patriarchates were formed; or the historic diversity in such matters as the structure of councils, the scope of episcopal authority or the participation of the laity in the Church's activities. And yet the life of the Church surely cannot be a mere precipitate of political, social and cultural conditions. The canonical regime is, rather, vnešnje viraženie dogmatičeskago učenia o tserkvi, 'the external expression of dogmatic teaching about the Church'.³¹

The witness of dogma provides the extra-temporal and imperishable element which must found the Church's organisation. Canonical structure may legitimately take various forms so long as certain limits are respected. If those limits were transgressed the essence of the Church would be placed in question. Thus for Afanasev the sixteenth century Reformers were right to demand the transformation of the late mediaeval Western church, whose forms were ill-adapted to new historical conditions. But they fell into arbitrariness by deforming aspects of ecclesiological doctrine. It is true that such doctrine, like all dogma, is only encountered as embodied in contingent historical forms - of which, in ecclesiology, canonical forms are the chief. No such canonical form can ever exhaust the mystery of the Church by constituting its plenary expression. It can only be an approach, relative to an historical moment. But such historical forms are not sheerly contingent. They are an attempt to express the Church's essence or at least one of its aspects. This is why a change in

canonical structure cannot present itself simply as re-adaptation to fresh historical circumstances, but must claim also to be the fruit of a desire for the more complete expression, in new conditions, of the ecclesial mystery: bolee adakvatnomu vyraženiyu suščestva tserkvi, 'a greater adequacy in expressing the essence of the Church'.³²

When canonical consciousness becomes totally enclosed within historical forms, the result is a deformation of Christian awareness itself. A temporal form, which of its nature is relative and unstable, usurps the place of the eternal: when the relative is absolutised the absolute is relativised. Instead, each epoch must find its own canonical consciousness, in relation to the eternal foundation of the Church. Apart from lack of uniformity, the most striking characteristic of Orthodox canon law, according to Afanasev, is its nepolnota, 'insufficiency'. It possesses no norms that can be called osnovnimi, 'fundamental'. Even in the richest canonical collections, whether Byzantine or Latin, there are no norms defining the ultimate principles of Church organisation. Thus, rules prescribe the relations that are to hold between bishops, or between presbyters and deacons, yet no rule prescribes the nature of the hierarchical principle itself. Should a future historian try to excogitate the life of the Church from its canons he would commit egregious errors. Similarly, those who claim to be able to disengage a single unified canonical consciousness from the canons themselves are mistaken. The whole creative, unprovided side of the Church's life escapes the purview of the existing canons. Moreover, each local (autocephalous) church has its own canonical consciousness, since it has its own manner of resolving problems: though this

can compromise the sense of belonging to a single Church, such particularism is not wholly a loss.³³

Since the foundations of canon law are not themselves juridical but dogmatic, ecclesiastical law differs from every other system of law. The canonical consciousness reflected in this sui generis system is distinguished from dogmatic consciousness only by its napravlennostyu, intentsiei, 'direction and intention'.³⁴

ii. The historicity of canon law

While the issue as to whether the canons are immutable or mutable has taken on a fresh urgency in contemporary Orthodoxy it is not, Afanasev remarks, a new problem. In its first and second canons, the council in Trullo appeared to come out in favour of immutability. Nevertheless, the Byzantine church continued to elaborate new canons, even after 692, and often these canons were promulgated through the authority of the civil power. Certain Byzantine jurists advanced the principle that the basileus could abrogate not only Justinian's code but all the canonical collections. It is true that this opinion was never officially approved, and fell into oblivion with the fall of the Empire, while the contrary approach of the council in Trullo remained influential. Today, while many give absolute value to the canons, this position leads in fact to theological nonsense. Logically, it would place not only our own generation but innumerable preceding ones under the Church's ban. One need only think of the ninth of the Apostolic Canons which excommunicates anyone who is present at the synaxis yet

fails to communicate.

What conclusions should be drawn from the de facto mutability of the canons? Afanasev insists that a recognition of the transitory element in the canons does not give individuals or even an entire ecclesial community carte blanche to change them at will. The canonical work of the Church constitutes in its totality a 'multi-saecular continuity', mnogovekovii opit, rich in experience in the task of incarnating the Church's essence in various contexts in space-time. We can only continue what has not begun with us. Only the combination of tradition and creativity, traditsii i tvorčestva, can ensure that our work will live on. We can and must modify the Church's legislation but only when canons have ceased to be true canons: that is, when they have ceased to embody canonical consciousness. At times canonical truth may be on the side of those who wish to transgress dead canons, not that of those who would impose them.

Naznačenie kanonov, kak tserkovnikh predpisaniĭ, sposobstvovat - položitelno ili otritsatelno - tomu, čtobi tserkovnaya žizn po vozmožnosti bliže voploščala dogmatičeskoe učenie.³⁵

In this process of creative conservation, the canonical consciousness itself remains one and the same. Thanks to its unity, the various forms the Church's life has taken are not atomised fragments but make up an organic process relating the original state of the Church, a charismatic regime, to our present ecclesiastical organisation. What is precious in the apostolic age is not the charismatic government of the primitive communities but their transperence to the mystery of the Church. We approach the life of the apostolic church not by copying its external forms but by expressing truth itself

in the Church's life, through a 'constant ecclesial creativity',
postoyannago tvorčestva tserkovnoi žizni.³⁶

Thus it is impossible for the Church to be in every sense changeless. This could be true only if the Church faced the desert, not the world. But where, then, is the dividing line between the changeless and the changing, and what is their inter-relationship? Without further ado, Afanasev places the dogmas on the side of the eternal. Concerning as they do vnutrennim istinam veri, the 'inner truth of faith', they are unchanging and mandatory for all. But is the region of the eternally immutable restricted to dogma, or does it touch in some way the canons themselves? For Protestantism, canonical determinations are simply ius humanum, and so entirely changeable. For Catholicism, those canonical decrees that are based on ius divinum are absolute and no Church authority can revoke them. On the other hand, those which spring from ius humanum to form ius ecclesiasticum can, if necessary, be appealed by some appropriate Church organ. Yet in both Protestant and Catholic solutions, a dichotomy opens up between the eternal and the temporal:

Eti dve oblasti otrivayutsya odna ot drugoi i polučayut samodovleyuščee značenie. V etom ležit nepolnota etogo otveta, tak kak utverždaya suščestvovanie dvukh spher v Tserkvi, on ne ustanavlivaet nikago meždu nimi vzamootnošeniya i svyazi.³⁷

The Orthodox Church does not know the concept of ius humanum any more than did the Councils or the Byzantine canonists. Apart from the canons of the Trullan council already referred to there is the ringing affirmation of the Second Council of Nicaea. After recalling not only the sweet law of Yahweh in psalm 118

and the Deuteronomic gift of the Torah, but the Pauline anathema in Galatians 1, 8 on those who pay heed to another Gospel, even one brought by an angel, its first canon proceeds:

Toutōn oun houtōs ontōn kai diamarturoumenōn hēmin,
agalliōmenoi ep' autois, hōs ei tis heuroi schula polla,
aspasiōs tous theious kanonas ensternizometha, kai
holoklēron tēn auton diatagēn kai asaleuton kratunomen,
tōn ektethentōn hupo tōn hagiōn salpiggōn tou Pneumatos
tōn paneuphēmōn apostolōn, tōn te hex hagiōn oikoumeneikōn
sunodōn, kai tōn topikōs sunasthrosthēisōn epī okdōsei
toioutōn diatagmatōn, kai tōn hagiōn paterōn hēmōn.³⁸

And as for the ius humanum, it was unknown to the great Byzantine canonists of the twelfth century. Nonetheless, canons have certainly been changed or revoked by the Church in the course of her history. Thus in its forty-eighth canon the council in Trullo itself set aside the Apostolic Canons by refusing to accept for the future any married candidates for the episcopacy. How are we to make sense of this apparent contradiction?

To answer this question, Afanasev proposes an entire ecclesiology in miniature. He speaks of Christian thought as tending always to one of two poles: Monophysitism and Nestorianism. But the proper content of that thought is Chalcedonian. Quite aside from its immediate implications for Christology, the Chalcedonian definition indicates the direction of truth in other areas of Christian reality, not least ecclesiology. And to illumine how this may be so, Afanasev turns to his other principal preoccupation of the mid 1930's: the iconic relation of the Church to the Eucharist. Combining references to I Peter and Paul's Corinthian correspondence, Afanasev describes the Church as the chosen people of the New Testament, the body

of Christ whose head is Christ himself. One 'abides' in the Church through partaking of the Eucharistic body of Christ, as I Corinthians 10, 16-17 makes clear: 'Hoti heis artos, hen sōma hoi polloi esmen, hoi gar pantes ek ton henos artou metechomen'. The Eucharistic gathering is at once empirical, an assembly of men and women, and spiritual, since Christ, the God-man, is present in the Eucharistic sacrifice. Like the Eucharist the Church has a dual nature.

Eya dvukhprirodnost est dvukhprirodnost bogočelovečeskago organizma i podobna dvukhprirodnost vo Khriste.³⁹

The relationship of her empirical and spiritual natures is determined by the Chalcedonian formula: undivided, inseparable, unchanging and unmingled. The division of the Church into visible and invisible is tserkovnoe nestorianstvo, 'ecclesial Nestorianism', the denial of her divine-human nature.

On the foundation of this Chalcedonian (and, linguistically, Solovyevan) ground-plan, Afanasev insists that the organic structure of the Church as the body of Christ springs from an inner order or taxis which reflects the very essence of the Church. This inner law of the Church finds expression in ecclesiological dogma, in hierarchy and in sacraments. But all of these things have a visible face. And here Afanasev opens a conversation with an interlocutor who will appear again in his work: the legal historian Rudolf Sohm. He disagrees with Sohm's view that the 'Catholic' Church pattern emerged through the penetration of law into primitive Christianity. On the contrary, the Church entered history as a society with a determinate structure, even though in the charismatic beginnings this structure was barely clothed in the fabric of history. In

a second metaphor, Afanasev asserts that nekoe postoyannoe yadro, 'a certain constant nucleus', endures throughout the Church's changing historical scenes of life. And he points out that the communities of the first Christian centuries developed fundamentally identical ecclesiastical structures despite the absence of a common canonical legislation. Afanasev accepts that historical conditions have influenced the Church's forms, but denies that they have done so in a deterministic fashion. Instead, they have acted as stimuli, eliciting from the Church a response of a creative kind.

Istoričeskiya usloviya vliyayut na formi tserkovnoi žizni, no ne tak, čto oni predpisivayut Tserkvi te ili iniya izmeneniya v eya žizni, no tak čto Tserkov sama iz svoei glubini izmenyaet svoi formi istoričeskago bitiya. Tserkov stremitsya, v dannikh istoričeskikh usloviyakh naiti takyu formu, v kotoroi naibolee polno i naibolee soveršenko virazilas bi suščnost Tserkvi, sama Tserkov i eya dogmatičeskoe učenie.⁴⁰

He sees a harmony between the Church's abiding essence and her historical existence such that her historical existence is: forma, v kotoroi suščnost Tserkvi voploščается v istorii, 'the form in which the essence of the Church is embodied in history'. In this light of this formula, Afanasev rejects the notion of a single ideal form for the Church's historical existence. If such a form, per impossibile, existed then the Church would cease to be historical, her empirical side engulfed by its spiritual counterpart. This Afanasev stigmatises as tserkovnoe monofizitstvo, 'ecclesial Monophysitism'.

Yet, disconcertingly, Afanasev's theological exploration of canon law ends in considerable uncertainty, hovering between a 'low' and a 'high' view of the status of that law vis-à-vis the Gospel of grace. On the one hand, Afanasev declares himself willing to suspend judgment on Sohm's thesis that the very idea of

ecclesiastical law is a contradiction in terms for a Church built on that Gospel. It is, he remarks, a hypothesis which has not been sufficiently studied. On the other hand, Afanasev ascribes to the canons, in the meantime, a 'theandric' stature. The divine-human will of the Church manifests itself through the canons so that her historical forms of existence may truly embody her essence. In this latter mood Afanasev concludes that the canons of the Church are 'filled with grace', blagodatno, being 'revealed truths', otkrovenniya istini, which are 'divinely inspired', bogoydokhnovenni. The canons are temporal only in the sense that they are applied to that which is temporal, the historical forms of the Church's existence. The truth that canons express is itself absolute, yet their content is not this truth itself, but the mode through which this truth must be expressed in a given historical form of the Church's life: to, kak ona dolzha viražatsya v dannoi istoričeskoj forme tserkovnoi žizni. Canons express the eternal in the temporal. The temporal is the 'how', kak, the mode of application, while the eternal is that which is applied.⁴¹

Thus the problem of the mutability or immutability of the canons is solved. As truths of divine revelation, they are immutable - but in a relative sense. Paradoxical as the phrase may sound, they are immutable for their own age. In Afanasev's own comparison, just as in physics a force can act only if it has a point of application, so too canons are active only if they have a point of application in the conditions of the Church's life for which they were decreed. If this point of application ceases to exist, they become inoperative and must be replaced. In this respect, the history of the Church knows periods of greater and less creativity in dealing with what has become

ossified with the advance of time. In periods marked by upadka tvorcheskoi deyatel'nosti, 'decline in creative activity', Church authority will not manage to respond adequately to a situation. In such cases the life of the Church makes up for the deficiency: Church customs arise, and these are constantly acquiring the status of canonical norms. Unfortunately, custom may supplement a lack of canonical creativity in both a positive and a negative way. In the latter instance, a false tradition can be created which leads the Church away from her dogmatic foundations and betrays her divine-human nature. Inertsia, 'inertia', must be overcome, then, by renewal of creative canonicity.

Tradition, properly understood, is not the mechanical repetition of the past but the acceptance of a principle of nepreivnosti žizni i tvorčestva, 'uninterrupted life and creativity', in the 'undiminished grace', neoskudevayuščei blagodati, that Irenaeus ascribes to the Church in what will prove a key-text of Afanasev's ecclesiology.

Ubi ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus Dei, et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia.⁴²

Collections of canonical decrees have existed and will continue to exist, but they will always lack pervii kanon, 'the first canon'. This primary canon is not itself a rule but the foundation of all rules. It is found in Tradition, and its content is the smysl, 'meaning', of canonical tradition. This canon tells us that canonical decrees are canonical only when they achieve that for which they were intended: expressing Spirit-given dogmatic truth in the concrete historical circumstances of the Church's existence. Afanasev offers

encouragement to those concerned with this task by reminding his readers that in and through the Church the historical process itself strains towards its final goal.

Tserkov ustremlena vpered, i vse v ožidanii Prišestviya, o kotorom ona neprestanno vozdikhaet, 'Ei, gryadi, Gospodi Iisuse'.⁴³

C. Two ideas of the Church universal (1934)

So far, Afanasev's studies of councils and canons have suggested that the crux of his thought lies in an attempt to relate the Church as mystery to the Church as institution. The uncomfortable gap which threatened to separate the transcendent side of a council as a disclosure of divine truth from its immanent aspect as an 'imperial-ecclesial institution' appears once again in his treatment of canon law. In their dogmatic aspect, the canons are divinely given, yet, should they lose their point of application for the Church's canonical consciousness, they become human, indeed all too human: so much so that Afanasev is willing to entertain Sohm's view that the invasion of the Church by inappropriate law is the origin of the Church's worst historical sins. At the same time, however, two positive clues have been offered for the construction of an ecclesiology which may help to shed light on these difficulties. On the issue of reception, Afanasev has spoken of the Church organism as an inter-action of giving and receiving among local churches. And in the effort to spell out what 'Chalcedonianism' might mean for canon law he has pointed to the Eucharistic assembly, with its twofold empirical and spiritual character, as at once the foundation of the Church, and her supreme icon.

The time has come for him to turn from study of the practical implications of patristic ecclesiology - councils, canons - to that ecclesiology itself. His investigation takes the form of enquiry into 'two ideas of the universal Church' associated with Cyprian of Carthage and Ignatius of Antioch respectively.⁴⁴

1. Cyprianic universality

Afanasev's starting-point is contemporary: the paradoxical absence of that church which least conceals its vselenskago prizvaniya, 'universal vocation', namely the Roman Catholic Church, from the Ecumenical Movement in which the Institut Saint-Serge was at that time so deeply involved. The Catholic sense of universal task is founded upon its traditional ecclesiology, and precisely by virtue of the universality (or ecumenicity) of its own claims Catholicism is self-debarred from sharing in the Ecumenical Movement. The historical genesis of that concept of the Church universal is Cyprian. The crucial text is found in Letter 55:

Una ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa est.⁴⁵
For Cyprian this means, according to Afanasev, that the single Christian Church, Christ's body, exists, in its empirical aspect, by being parcelled out into distinct 'church communities', tserkovniya obščini. In I Corinthians 12, 12-27 Paul had declared:

Kathaper gar to sōma en estin kai melē polla echei, panta de ta melē tou sōmatos polla onta hen estin sōma, houtōs kai ho Christos.

But the Pauline motif of individual persons as members of

Christ's body is transposed by Cyprian to the level of churches. The universal Church becomes thereby the 'aggregate' or 'totality', sovkupnost, of individual ecclesial obščini. But this must surely have lamentable consequences. For while Paul saw the presence of the one Church among the Corinthians as the means to the overcoming of their divisions, Cyprian uses identical Pauline language to set forth a positive theology of division. Whereas Paul asks, in regard to the Church-body of Christ, memeristai ho Christos, Cyprian declares in multa membra divisa est.

In his vision of the Church as Christ's body, Paul was taking an image, obraz, of the Church from the celebration of the Eucharist, iz evkharističeskago momenta. It is in that moment that the Church grasps her own reality as the living unity of Christ's body, becoming aware only by a secondary movement of reflection of her multiplicity. The Eucharistic assembly is 'integral unity', tselostnoe edinstvo. A eucharistic understanding of the universal Church as the summation of individual churches is impossible. No eucharistic assembly can be empirically the Church universal, though mystically each is fully identical therewith. Afanasev denies any legitimate place in ecclesiology to the Cyprianic metaphors of the tree and its branches or the body and its limbs wherever entire churches are concerned. While such images are organic and not mechanical they suggest nevertheless a purely external linkage between local churches.

In considering how the unity of the universal Church is effected, Cyprian concentrates on the episcopate. Just as the one Church is diffused into the many churches so is the single

episcopate into many bishops. Yet Cyprian's concept of episcopal unity as concora numerositas is, to Afanasev's mind, more satisfying than the portrait of the Church's unity which it is meant to serve. For Cyprian, the episcopate is mpožeštvennost otdelnikh episkopov, soedinnikh bratskoj serdečnoj lyubovyu: a 'multiplicity of individual bishops united by brotherly ties of cordial affection'. Within this harmonious solidarity, each bishop has equal rights, received directly from Peter, and acts in vice Christi, focussing his church in such a way that its many members become a unity through his ministry. In becoming such a unity, those local Christians become simultaneously members of the universal Church. Similarly, it is through his community as a limb of Christ's body that the bishop holds his place as a member of the episcopate. It is this dialectical interweaving that Cyprian wishes to convey in his famous formula that the Church is in the bishop and the bishop in the Church. The concourse of bishops both sustains and reflects the concourse of the universal Church.⁴⁶

Afanasev admits the power of Cyprian's ecclesiology. He notes Cyprian's confidence in defending the practice of the local Carthaginian church, in the matter of the lapsi and the rebaptism of heretics, against the Roman see. However, such action did not derive from Cyprian's universalist picture of the Church but from the 'spiritual experience', duchovnago opita, of his community. Moreover, Cyprian's projection of the Church is, in effect, a 'truncated cone', usečennago konusa. The lowest level is provided by the union of local churches, above which comes the united episcopate. But Cyprian fails to indicate the apex which his picture requires. Yet there

was a natural eagerness to finish off Cyprian's work, and 'this Rome did': eto sdelal Rim. And here Afanasev turns to Thomas Aquinas' Summa contra Gentiles where he finds the statement that, because of the need to preserve unity in the universal Church:

manifestum est ... regimen Ecclesiae sic esse dispositum
ut unus toti Ecclesiae praesit.⁴⁷

The same requirement of unity which posits the bishop in the local church postulates the pope in the Church universal. If one rejects the need for a head in the latter, one necessarily does the same for the former. The vice Christi of the local community is complemented by the vicarius Christi of its world-wide counterpart.

Vlast papi po suščestvu est vlast edinaya i vselenskaya, tak kak naznačenie etoi vlasti sochranyat empiričeskoe edinstvo vselenskoj tserkvi čerez vozglavlenie vselenskogo episkopata.⁴⁸

An ecclesial community can only belong to the Church through its bishop, but a bishop can only be the caput of his church through membership of the universal episcopate, whose criterion of unity is the Roman bishop. But in this case, the cone's foundations can and must be expanded until they coincide with the empirical boundaries of the Church, which are co-terminous with the earth itself. Thus for the Roman Catholic 'system', sistem, the power of the Roman bishop cannot be other than universal. For Catholic thinking and feeling, Afanasev avers, nelzya ograničit etu vlast. nelzya voiti s nei v nekotorii kompromiss: 'it is impossible to limit this power or to subject it to compromise'. Thus one must either accept this universal bishop, or find another understanding of the single Church and its universal character. It is to this second task that Afanasev will

shortly turn.

The Cyprianic idea of the Church took a new lease of life with the conversion of Constantine, for it proved able to enter into synthesis with the Roman imperial ideology. It impregnated that ideology while undergoing significant modification by it. The universal Church became the 'ecumenical' Church. Without entering into the philology of the term oikoumenē, Afanasev asserts that, by all indications, the word signified to Byzantine people, whether in the political or ecclesiastical spheres, the empire itself. And drawing on his earlier research, he points out that the first seven ecumenical councils were originally so called because they were imperial councils, imperskimi soborami. Our first intelligence concerning the 'imperial church' comes from the Antiochene council of 268 where Paul of Samosata was condemned by all the bishops of the oikoumenē. Inevitably, when the Christian Church became dominant, this notion would arouse ever greater interest. Yet here it should be borne in mind that the ecumenical Church included not just the Church within the empire's territorial frontiers, but the whole inhabited earth, naselennaya zemlya, oikoumenē gē, which the Roman augustus claimed. The emperor's pretensions to govern all Christians would be rehearsed in Byzantium until the fourteenth century. Such a Christianising of the imperial idea, productive as it was of an 'ecclesial imperialism', tserkovnago-imperializma, simply reinforced the Cyprianic inheritance of the pre-Constantinian era.

Cyprian had recognised the fundamental equality of local churches. But it was easy for a spirit of competitiveness to arise between them once re-contextualised within the Roman

empire. The coming of the 'ecumenical' Church gave the ambitious a goal: domination of the rest whenever the consent of all member-churches was sought. Consequently, the interneccine struggles of Alexandria, Constantinople and Rome 'filled Church history', napolnena tserkovnaya istoriya. The adoption by the Constantinopolitan patriarchs of the title 'ecumenical' in the sixth century or slightly earlier was a claim to just this kind of primacy in the imperial Church. The Roman popes protested in vain against this style, for the empire stood behind their rival. The Roman church was of much greater significance in purely churchly terms, yet a parvenu, by applying the terms of the Cyprianic ecclesiology, might always maintain, in the words of I Corinthians 12, 24: ho Theos sunekerasen to sōma. tō husteroumenō perissoteran dous timēn. Within an 'ecumenical' understanding of the Church, such as Cyprian had established, the idea of ecclesial 'supervision' or 'care', popečeniya, necessarily took on the character of a claim to rights, pravovoi charakter. Ineluctably, therefore, it ended in ecclesial imperialism. Despite all their differences, Rome and Constantinople were agreed on one point: the need for a universal supremo, glavenstvy, in the universal-ecumenical Church.⁴⁹

Inevitably, the importance of Constantinople was bound to wane when the Roman-Byzantine empire failed. On the other hand, the Byzantine decline finally liberated the Roman papacy. Though the Byzantine empire and church fell into ruins, the ecumenical idea they had fostered would survive. It was an idea very close, očen blizkaya, to that self-understanding which the Catholic church possesses today. The late Byzantine

church was perfectly capable of claiming for its own principal see that it was the 'universal tribunal', to which should come all Christians with grievances to receive satisfaction. But by the Palaeologan period the rise of the Papacy and the development of the principle of autocephaly among the Eastern churches had made this statement wholly anachronistic. The concorde numerositas was broken down in the East into 'fully autonomous ecclesial unities', the 'local churches': ypolne samostoyatelniya edinitsi - domestniya tserkvi. These churches, Afanasev judges, became closed in on themselves and their own interests, degenerating into frankly national concerns. The national idea of the modern period could not be reconciled with the imperial. Autocephaly is simply an accommodation to the changed conditions of 'national imperialism'.⁵⁰ Thus the fate of Cyprianic ecclesiology in the East was singularly bankrupt. In the West, however, the success of the historical mission of Rome left little place for any other idea of the universal Church. The East did not lose its consciousness of spiritual unity, despite the outward division of its members. Such awareness was perhaps maintained, Afanasev suggests, on the basis of a different idea of the Church's universality than that found in Cyprian. Admittedly, it was historically inefficacious, and had but little influence on dogmatic reflection. But joined with the Khomiakovian concept of sobornost, the continuing sense of spiritual oneness provided the conditions for a possible re-birth of a non-Cyprianic understanding of universality on the soil of Orthodox faith. Afanasev believed that at the time of his writing, there were signs of such a re-birth: minute, perhaps, yet witnessing to bol'sikh peremenakh,

proskhodvašikh v samikh glubinakh tserkovnago organizma, 'great changes afoot, arising from the depths of the ecclesial organism'. The authentic nature of the Orthodox church is beginning to show itself.

ii. Ignatian universality

From Cyprian Afanasev passes on to Ignatius whom he describes as, like Cyprian, ne tolko ottsom tserkvi, no i učitelem o tserkvi: 'not simply a father of the Church but a teacher about the Church'. Ignatius' interest was not confined to his local community. His ecumenicity of vision aligns him with Cyprian yet, unlike Cyprian, he actually understood Paul's teaching on the Church as the body of Christ. For him, the Church that offers the Eucharist is necessarily Christ's body in its fulness.

Kak v evkharističeskoj Žertve prebivaet ves Khristos, tak v každoi tserkovnoi obščine est vsya polnota Khristova tela.⁵¹

This is how Afanasev interprets Ignatius' affirmation in his letter to the Church at Smyrna: hopou an ē Iēsous Christos, ekei hē katholikē ekklēsia.⁵² Every ecclesial obščina is the 'universal Church', though only that obščina is Church in which Christ is present. Afanasev suggests that in all probability Ignatius arrived at this understanding by reflection on Matthew 18,20: hou gar eisin duo hē treis sunēgmenoi eis to emon onoma, ekei eimi en mesō autōn. In the light of 18, 17, on the obligation of the fallen brother to listen tēs ekklēσίας Afanasev does not hesitate to speak of this Matthaean logion as an 'explanation of the nature of the Church', obyasneniem

prirodi tserkvi. In place of the Old Testament understanding of the community as focussed on the Jerusalem temple where the divine Name had taken up its habitation, the ecclesial assembly is henceforth wherever in Christ's name a minimum of two or three gather - on the principle that tres faciunt collegium. Three may be reduced to two, for a couple makes the church: malaya tserkov, the 'micro-church'. But here, going beyond the explicit content of Matthew's text, Afanasev brings in the Eucharist.

Tsentróm takoi obščini yavlyatsya ne ierusalemskii khram, a evkharističeskoe prinošenie.⁵³

Justifying this statement by reference to Paul's comments in I Corinthians 10, 16, Afanasev maintains that the presence of Christ is so found in every 'plenary', polnomi, church that it is his Body, and that because of the Eucharistic action. Whereas the Old Testament people of God were that one elect nation enjoying the privilege of access to the Temple, their New Testament counterpart is all those of whatever nation who have access to the body of Christ.

Apart from the Eucharist, the other sign of the ecumenical Church in Ignatius, as in Cyprian, is the bishop. As Ignatius tells the Smyrnaeans, honou an phanē ho episkopos. ekei to plēthos ētō, a phrase which anticipates Cyprian's Ecclesia in episcopo est et episcopus in ecclesia est. But in Ignatius, this bond between church and bishop subsists through the Eucharist:

Spoudasate oun mia eucharistia chrēsthai mia gar sarx tou kuriou hēmōn Iēsou Christou kai hen potērion eis henōsin tou haimatos autou, hen thusiastērion, hōs heis episkopos hama tō presbuteriō kai diakonois tois sundoulois mou.⁵⁴

Cyprian's 'dialectical interweaving' of church and bishop appears now radically defective for lack of Eucharistic reference.

Afanasev insists that Ignatius' ascription of a catholic or ecumenical character to the local church in no way reduces the significance of other churches. No more does one celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice undermine the rest, or the presence of the whole Godhead in one Trinitarian hypostasis prejudice the divine reality in the other two.

Khristos odin i tot že v každoi tserkovnoi obšine.

Soznanie polnago realnago prisutstviya Khrista dolžno svyazivat s drugom otdelniya obščini.⁵⁵

This 'catholic' assembly excludes juridical 'attitudes', otnošeniya, or 'ties', svyazi, between communities. But on the other hand, it strengthens that other attitude and tie, which is lyubvi, 'love'. Such love is so vital a sign of the identity of the community that it was made its name, as we see from Ignatius' use of agapē for the church's assembly.⁵⁶ The combination, svyazannost, of the disparate communities is founded on the fact that there can no more be variance or discord, neosglānost, between them than Christ can be at variance or in discord with his own self. Each community 'receives in love', prinimaet s lyubovyu, what is done in another. Or, more precisely, Afanasev adds, what is done in one is done also in all, insofar as there cannot truly be 'two', as there are not two Christs. And conversely, reciprocal non-acceptance witnesses to the fact that one of the communities has erred and made some decision without izvolenia svyatago Dukha, its 'being good to the Holy Spirit'. Loving concord, soglasovannost, however, does not rule out a

loving hierarchy between the communities, nor that one might 'preside in love', predsedatelstvuyúšei v lyubvi, and carry out a ministry of 'ecclesial care', tserkovnoe popečenie, in relation to the others. But it excludes all absorption, pogloščenie, or dissolution, rastvorenie, of one community by another. It guards the 'absolute value', 'equivalence' and 'inimitability' - tsennost, ravnotsennost, nepovtorimost, of each. The accession of an ecclesial community to the agapé is not the addition of an item. The soyuz, 'alliance', is not the arithmetical sum of its parts. The communities are non-addable unities. Nor will Afanasev allow that each community is a part of an organic whole. Organic quality attaches to each community: there is no organism of a 'higher nature', viššago priroda, which can stand above them in the union of love.

The idea of a universal Church is adequately served by such an ecclesiological conception for the union of love aspires to be as broad as earth's bounds. Afanasev insists that this concept has nothing in common with the Roman Catholic idea of the Church universal, nor with the Byzantine notion of a church of the imperial oikoumenē. Its distinctive character is that, in its terms, the Church needs no visible head. Though each local community has an episcopal head, there is no such head, nor can there be, for the union of love as a whole.

Afanasev concludes by regretting that the Ignatian idea of catholicity had such little influence in the Church's history. It fell from view with the ante-Nicene Church. But within that comparatively brief period, the catholic consciousness of each ecclesial group was such that it sensed, oščuščala, the Church's nature. Despite the absence of legal ties between

the local churches their sense of unity exceeded that found in later centuries. The post-Nicene unifying of communities into organisms of various sizes had the effect of highlighting their regional, and hence competitive, interests, and in so doing weakened awareness of common mission. At the time of the first council of Constantinople, and even after, remote Cappadocia could play as vital a role as Rome. As time went on, the stars even of such great patriarchal or quasi-patriarchal centres as Alexandria, Antioch, and Ephesus grew dim in the stronger light of the Old and New Rome. Finally, the Papacy turned kafolichnost, 'catholicity', into universalizm, 'universalism'. The liberation of the Papacy from such universalism, and the East from its separatism, can only be brought about by a return to the original concept of catholicity.⁵⁷

Afanasev's conviction that the North African ecclesiology of Cyprian represents a deviation from the New Testament vision of the Church, whilst the Syrian ecclesiology of Ignatius was its authentic continuation thus received a first, schematic formulation. Its attraction lay in its power to resolve the problems Afanasev's studies of councils and canons had thrown up, while integrating the positive insights into the nature of the Church which he had gleaned. An inter-active series of local churches, each defined as a eucharistic assembly with its bishop-president, has no absolute need for either council or canon law, though in the providential movement of history it may benefit from both. Ignatian universality gives priority to the reciprocal witness of churches, rather than their submission to a common conciliar authority, and it takes its source from the Eucharist, not from a system of rights and

duties. Afanasev now looked to embody this fundamental intuition of an historian of the early Church in a fuller and more detailed form.

Chapter III:2 The war years and afterwards

The canvas on which Afanasev hoped to deploy his biblical and patristic scholarship would prove his most substantial work, Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo.⁵⁸

A. Church of the Holy Spirit (1940-1971)

In the Introduction, Afanasev confesses that he has drawn the title of this work from the Montanist writings of Tertullian. Montanist it may be but the Great Church should salvage it.⁵⁹ For though founded by Christ at the Last Supper, the Church was only really actualised at Pentecost, when the glorified Lord sent his Spirit on his disciples. The invasion of concepts and institutions belonging to Roman law obscured the basically charismatic, Spirit-given, nature of the Church. Afanasev cites once again a favoured passage from Irenaeus' Adversus Haereses on the relation of Church and Spirit.⁶⁰ Yet the Orthodox manuals give the impression that the hierarchical structure of the Church is institutional, not charismatic. As a result, the charismatic quality of the early Church appears as something peculiar to that epoch which later generations could jettison at will. While recognising that the baptised

are regenerated by the Spirit, the manuals give little further attention to the implications of this, reserving the term dukhovnoe, 'spiritual', for the ministerial priesthood. By refusing to take seriously the transformation of believers, the theological culture of contemporary Orthodoxy is, au fond, no differently situated from that of liberal theology outside the dogmatic tradition.

The starting-point of ecclesiology should be the faith-given perception of the Church as the fulfilment of the Old Testament promise that Yahweh's Spirit would be poured out on all flesh.⁶¹ The Spirit is received as the pledge of a new aeon to which the Church belongs, though empirically she remains a reality of secular time. The spreading abroad of the Spirit in baptism makes the faithful a royal priesthood called to ministry among mankind and before the Father. Such ministry finds its supreme expression in the eucharistic assembly, which articulates the unity of a local church. As 'Dve idei vselenskoï Tserkvi' had already proposed, the unity and fulness of the Church are found not in the sum or confederation of local churches but in the inner reality of each.

Buduči edinoi vo vseï svoei polnote, Tserkov ostavalast vseгда vnutrenne-universalnoi, t.k. každaya mestnaya tserkov soderžala v sebe vse ostalnie mestnie tserkvi.⁶²

This pattern of the patristic church is neither Congregationalism nor a recipe for sectarian division. No church could separate from the rest, for it could not separate from Christ. All churches were united in agapē, the love of all the churches for each, and of each for all. Church history may be read as a movement from an intrinsic to an extrinsic universalism.

The modern type of universalism, where the Church is seen as a single entity parcelled out in local communities and with some kind of common administrative system may be a necessity of our era, but if so it is a cruel necessity which fails to reflect the primitive shape of the Church. Not that the early communities lacked administration. There was always a principle of order in the Church: namely, the Holy Spirit, for in Paul's words in I Corinthians 14,33: ou gar estin akatastasis ho theos alla eirēnēs. Concretely, there has always been a ministry of leadership correlative to the royal and universal priesthood. Without a ministry of presidency the celebration of the eucharistic assembly could not proceed, and if there is no eucharistic assembly there is no Church. Derived from the role of Jesus at the Last Supper, this office was held by Peter in the post-Pentecost Church. It now belongs to the bishop whose task is therefore the most crucial of all in the post-apostolic community. As Afanasev asks rhetorically:

Est li i možet li bit čto libo više služeniya togo litsa, ktorii v Evkharističeskom sobranii zanyal mesto apostolov?⁶³

This Introduction serves as an overture in which all the principal themes of Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo are heard. The first three chapters will deal with the universal priesthood; the next four with the particularised or differentiated Christian ministry; the final chapter will take the form of a fundamental ecclesiology in brief compass. In the latter Afanasev's attitude to the State and to canon law takes sharper and less nuanced form than hitherto.

I. The royal priesthood

Drawing on a catena of biblical texts, Afanasev questions the making of any ontological distinction between layman and cleric. The tearing of the Temple veil in Matthew's passion narrative signifies that the company of the Messiah is now invited into the sanctuary of the Most High described in Hebrews. The people of the new covenant, as we learn from I Peter, is composed of kings and priests. And following Paul's Corinthian correspondence, every member of the Church is called to his special service by the gift of the Spirit, and so he enters upon his particular activity by means of the common principle of all life and service in the Church. Afanasev identifies the pneumatikas thusias of I Peter with the Eucharist which is performed in the Spirit: the oikos pneumatikos of the same epistle being Peter's version of the Pauline sōma tou Christou idea. Both of these New Testament ecclesiologies depend on primitive tradition going back to Jesus himself: Afanasev regards the Johannine logion peri tou naou tou sōματος autou as reflecting Jesus' teaching on how his disciples would share his 'pontifical', unitive, activity between men and God.⁶⁴ In the light of such texts every layman can be regarded as a klēros, a member of God's priestly portion. Diversity of ministries does not overthrow this truth. Afanasev takes issue with Tertullian's statement in De exhortatione castitatis that the difference inter ordinem et plebem was introduced by ecclesial authority alone.⁶⁵ On the contrary, it 'flows from the very idea of the Church', vitekaet iz samogo ponyatiya Tserkvi, for the Church is an organic, that is, a simultaneously unified

yet differentiated, reality.⁶⁶ But theological thought has misread the nature of the new Israel, recreating within the Church the tabernacle of the Old Testament approachable by the priestly class alone. The sword which thus divided the ecclesial body was the Byzantine doctrine of consecration whereby Order rather than the sacraments of initiation became the primary creator of holy persons. A parallel development took place in the West, reaching its apogee with the teaching of Trent that the ordained cannot be 'reduced' to laymen because of their ontological difference.⁶⁷

Afanasev reviews a considerable amount of patristic and Byzantine literature in order to show that in baptism and chrismation the laity are permanently established in holiness as a liturgical people. Such 'establishing', postavlenie, in the earliest known baptismal order, that of Hippolytus of Rome, includes an epiclesis over the baptised: by the descent of the Spirit they will leitourgein, serving God as his priests.⁶⁸ This is accompanied by the laying-on of hands, a gesture which has fallen out of initiation rites in the Greek East, and by anointing which, again, is royal and priestly when seen against its Old Testament background.⁶⁹ The white garments in which the newly baptised and initiated are arrayed in, for instance, Ambrose, Cyril of Jerusalem and the (Byzantine) Siniatic Euchologion also symbolise priestly dignity.⁷⁰ The same is true of the practice of crowning the baptised, known in the patristic West and among non-Byzantine Orientals, or the tonsuring mentioned by Symeon of Thessalonica as a venerable custom.⁷¹ In the Byzantine rite, the newly-baptised are also conducted around the altar, yet another mark of their sacerdotal

status.⁷²

The fundamental ministry of the laity who are thus established is Eucharistic. When the people of God gather, each, as Justin Martyr describes the scene, comes before God as liturgist.⁷³ Such common ministry of the faithful in the Eucharist is the ministerial action of the Church comme tel, whereas the activity of differentiated ministries is simply ministry within and for the Church. There can be no celebration of the sacraments without this people who are co-liturgists with their 'president', proestōs. Citing Ignatius of Antioch and Origen in support of this statement, Afanasev argues that were it not true the theses of such schismatic groups as Novatianists and Donatists would be sustained.⁷⁴ If the sacramental act were effected by certain members of the Church taken separately then the unworthiness of the latter would necessarily colour the value of that act. Afanasev portrays the ministry of the laity as threefold: v oblasti suvaščennodeistviva, upravleniya, učitelstva: 'in the area of sacraments, of administration, of teaching'.

In the sacramental domain, Afanasev proves a vigorous critic of the Byzantine development. The invention of the iconostasis, whereby sanctuary and altar disappear from the people's vision, is no less than a re-creation of the Temple veil.⁷⁵ Canon sixty-nine of the council in Trullo discouraged the laity from entering the sanctuary. The Byzantine canonist Theodore Balsamon reported that he tried in vain to realise this rule, for the people protested against an incursion on their ancient privilege. His younger contemporary John Zonaras was worried by the custom of permitting the emperor to occupy the sanctuary: might it be the thin end of the wedge?⁷⁶ Of a

piece with this exclusion of the laity from architectural space was their exclusion from linguistic space: the practice of reading the liturgical prayers mustikōs started as early as the fourth century but was opposed by Justinian.⁷⁷ Yet the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom itself undoubtedly has as its basic form the co-celebration of bishop and people. Drawing on Cyprian Kern's study of the Orthodox Liturgy Afanasev is able to cite in this regard Chrysostom's own account of his eucharistic practice in his Pauline commentaries, as well as texts of Denys of Alexandria, Theodoret of Cyr and Cyril of Jerusalem.⁷⁸ The Liturgy of St. Basil, also used on certain days in the Byzantine Church, is an even clearer witness to this basic reality of co-celebration.⁷⁹ Canon two of the Council of Antioch threatens with excommunication, moreover, those who attend the Liturgy but refuse to communicate. Afanasev traces the way canonists attempted to square this with the later infrequency of communicating.⁸⁰ The final fruit of the division of the Church into sacred and profane members, he writes, is the doctrine of spiritual communion. Despite its base in Origen, who writes of communication in the Logos through his word, this doctrine makes nonsense of the Eucharist by rendering the Eucharist superfluous.⁸¹

In the domain of administration, Afanasev argues that the role of the laity here is to discern and test what is done by Church leaders.⁸² In Russia, the sixteenth century Muscovite 'Council of the Hundred Chapters' had found itself obliged to correct lay deviations in parish life, but in the synodal period the popular part in Church administration was suppressed so thoroughly that the Church became a department of State:

vsa tserkovnaya žizn bila postroena na pravovom načale, a sama Tserkov stala gosudarstvennim učreždeniem.⁸³

Yet Afanasev strongly objects to the reforms introduced by the Moscow Sobor of 1917-1918 which, in endeavouring to restore to the laity their full place, turned them into co-administrators with the episcopate. The Church's structure can never become legal-democratic for one cannot transfer grace to elected representatives. Nevertheless, as the letters of Cyprian demonstrate, the people are not passive recipients of episcopal decrees: they are active in their discriminating reception of leadership.⁸⁴ The bishop's office is given by God but it remains in and for the Church. Without the people's co-operation his ministry ceases to be charismatic and ecclesial and becomes juridical, without symphonia in the church body.⁸⁵

In the doctrinal realm, Afanasev points out that the Council in Trullo excluded the laity from teaching doctrine, basing itself on First Corinthians and Gregory Nazianzen's comments thereon.⁸⁶ It is not easy to determine just what 'teachers', didaskaloi, were in apostolic times. Afanasev inclines to the view that while the liturgical homily was given by the proestōs in e.g. Justin Martyr's church, doctrinal teaching in other forms was given by other people. Justin himself could be regarded as a didaskalos with a bishop by his side.⁸⁷ In the third century there was a tendency to confine teaching to bishops as the celebrated controversy over Origen makes clear. Demetrius of Alexandria was happy for Origen to teach only outside the liturgical assembly and in the bishop's absence. The Palestinian bishops who had befriended him came to his defence on the point of principle. In Palestine by an

older custom didaskaloi had this right.⁸⁸ In the Byzantine Church, however, under the influence of the nineteenth and sixty-fourth Trullan canons, doctrine became an exclusively episcopal preserve. The canonists appealed to the notion of delegation by the Byzantine patriarch as a way of reconciling theory with practice, but for Afanasev, since teaching, like all ministries, is a charismatic gift, it can hardly be made possible by a juridical action.⁸⁹

Afanasev sees two roles for the laity in matters of doctrine. First, as with administration, they are judges and witnesses of the doctrine proposed to them. The 'consent of the faithful' is part of ecclesial criteriology in deciding whether something be a genuine part of Tradition. Without reception by the faithful, indeed, conciliar determinations themselves would remain mere theologoumena. Afanasev does not approve of a qualification entered here by the Catholic scholar P. Dabin, leaning on the authority of Melchior Cano's De locis theologicis. He rejects Dabin's view that the object of the consensus fidelium ne s'étend manifestement pas aux plus subtiles d'entre les vérités.⁹⁰ Secondly, Afanasev holds that the laity can do scientific work in theology as a personal contribution to the doctrinal life of the Church. While this is not, strictly speaking, part of the Church's public teaching activity it shares nevertheless in her charismatic character. Thus the freedom of the laity to research and to write is not a 'liberal' freedom but an aspect of the creativity of the Church's own life. There can always be prophecy in the Church: not the 'new prophecy' of the Montanists, but the ancient yet young prophecy of the Pentecostal Spirit. Here Afanasev draws on both earlier

Russian theology and that of his contemporaries by conflating elements from Khomiakov and Berdyaev. From Khomiakov he takes the notion that in the Church, freedom, truth and love are co-extensive: freedom is the corollary of love, and truth is the content of freedom. From Berdyaev he takes the idea that freedom is zalog tvorčestva v Tserkvi, 'the gage of creativity in the Church', being inexhaustible so long as the Spirit dwells within her.⁹¹ In this connexion, he defines the goal of theological research in terms of the movement of ressourcement which, as we are discovering, is the moving spirit of his own work.

Zadačei bogoslovskogo issledoraniya yavlyaetsya otkritie i poznanie iznačalnogo predaniya, kotoroe v Tserkvi ostavayal neizmennim, zabrivaetsya často vremennim i prekhodyaščim.⁹²

In this attempt to recover the vernal originality of Pentecost, theologians, including laymen, will from time to time arouse controversy in the Church. The Church's judgment should be given after time, after sifting by all concerned, since it is not legal but ecclesial; reception by the rest of the Church will show if it is also authentic.

II. The task of ministry

In describing this delo služeniya, Afanasev points out that the very Spirit by which all are baptised distributes particular gifts of ministry within the body.

Vse blagodatni v Tserkvi, t.k. vse polučayut dari, no polučaeyut ikh v zavisimosti ot togo služeniya, k kotoromu oni prizivayutsya.⁹³

The New Testament lists of such ministries are helpful but not wholly determinative. They were not meant to be comprehensive: such letters are not ecclesiological treatises. In any case, in the apostolic period the Church is in fieri, in the process of being born. With the help of other early Christian writings and of the patristic witness Afanasev hopes to fill out this picture. He considers three themes: the nature of differentiated ministry as charismatic office in the local church; the variety of that ministry, summed up in the four offices of apostle, evangelist, prophet and doctor; and the emergence of the historic episcopate.

On the general nature of particularised ministry, he argues that neither the New Testament nor the Didache, suitably interpreted, support the view that the ancient Church knew two distinct types of organisation, one charismatic, the other - presbyter-bishops and deacons - institutional. He devotes considerable attention to the Didache in this context, admitting that on a cursory reading that text might give succour to those who maintain a universalist ecclesiology of the Cyprianic kind. At first sight, the Didache suggests a scheme whereby, in addition to functionaries serving the specific needs of local churches, there were also people whose ministry was universal, across the boundaries of the constituent 'parts' of the one Church.⁹⁴ Afanasev tries to rebut this conclusion by a number of arguments. Comparing the Didache with the Acts of the Apostles, he points out that for the latter presbyters can be sent to other local churches, while prophets and didaskaloi belonged to particular communities. Even apostles stayed for a long time in a given place. From this chain of texts he

generalises: apostles, prophets and doctors were always members of a determinate church and their journeys were commissioned by that Church. Secondly, if there are prophets unattached to a local church in the Didache (per improbabile), then their disappearance is not surprising as their existence was an abuse. Thirdly, the Didache probably stems from somewhat obscure tiny churches on the fringes of the Roman Empire whose practice was likely to be unusual. Fourthly, the whole matter is obscure anyway, as so much in the primitive community. In any case, it is misleading to imagine charismatic prophets pursuing their ministry through the inner inspiration of the Spirit, whilst episcopal 'overseers' function as merely the administrative deputies of a local church.⁹⁵ In the Church there is no dichotomy between the play of the Spirit and the wheels of the institution. All ministry is established by grace. In ordaining a bishop the church united in its eucharistic assembly prays for the descent of the Spirit on one whom the same Spirit has elected, predestined and designated for ministry.⁹⁶ The difference between the ministry of presbyter-bishops and deacons on the one hand and that of prophet, evangelist and doctor on the other is that the latter is not so necessary to the concrete existence of the local church as is the pastoral ministry. A church might be endowed with them; or again it might not. If it is, it could confide to a prophet a mission to serve other churches. In other words, the degree of participation by the local church in someone's ministry may be greater or less. What Afanasev is most anxious to stress is that it can never be nil.⁹⁷

Afanasev proceeds to deal with four particular ministries.

Following Paul, apostles occupy the first place among particular ministries. The apostles became such at Pentecost: i.e. they came into being qua apostles with the Church herself. The apostles were the bearers of the Church's initial tradition; called to this apostolic ministry by Christ on the Damascus Road, Paul actually became an apostle only by being initiated into this same tradition: hence the importance of the recognition of his apostleship by the Twelve. From the start, the mission of the apostles had an ecclesial character. It was aimed not at the conversion of individuals but at the constitution of the body of Christ. In gathering assemblies of believers around the celebration of the Eucharist the apostles created local churches, each identical with that first eucharistic assembly in whose course the Church had become Church in the persons of the Twelve. The ministry of the apostles is unique and thus non-transmissible. Nevertheless, their work of Church-making must continue. And by creating local churches dependent for their eucharistic assembly on a president, they also created the ministry of proestōs which would in time pass to the bishop.⁹⁸

By contrast, the task of such evangelists as Philip, in Afanasev's view, was the procuring of individual conversion. When their preaching took place outside a local church it was rounded off by the apostles who formed a new local church for the neophytes. In the post-apostolic age, figures of this kind inherited the evangelical side of the ministry of the apostles. Eusebius' Pantaenus would be an example.⁹⁹ Acting in the name of extant churches the sub-apostolic evangelists founded daughter-churches whose presidents they most likely became.¹⁰⁰

The ministry of prophets is the announcing to the Church of the will of God by whose terms she should live and act. The charism of prophecy is not a matter of acquiring new items of faith, as may be seen from the Fourth Evangelist on the Paraclete, the Paul of Galatians and the Didache.¹⁰¹ Afanasev connects it with that charism of judgment or the discernment of spirits which he has already discussed under the rubric of služenie laikov v oblasti učitelstva. Bringing to the witness-stand Hermas, Irenaeus and Eusebius as well as Paul, Afanasev regards prophecy as the speech-acts of the prophet combined with the judgment of the Church.¹⁰² The Didachist licenses eucharistic presidency by prophets, but this Afanasev stigmatises as Montanist. Such exaggeration of the prophet's standing derives, he believes, from the erroneous notion that there is such a thing as the Church 'in general', of which the prophet can be a high priest and so priest of whatever local church he happens to be visiting. Here the true concept of the Church has given way, retrogressively, to the Old Testament ideal of the Israelite qahal, a people en masse.¹⁰³

The ministry of doctor was, positively, to instruct the Church by expounding the truths of faith and negatively, to defend that faith against pagans, and especially against the Roman civil power. While Clement of Alexandria's Stromateis¹⁰⁴ offer perhaps the best patristic account of this office, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Prima Clementis show it in action. Though the Epistle to Diognetus, in its caution about innovatory theology, raises the possibility of false doctors, showing a distinct suspicion of the didaskaloi,¹⁰⁵ their ministry was the invaluable contribution of savants to the Gospel.

Didaskali učenie bogoslovie dvernei Tserkvi, predstavileli bogoslovskoi nauki, kotoraya služit Tserkvi.¹⁰⁶

Yet none of these four ministries has the centrality for the later church which belongs to that of the predstoyateli v Gospode, the 'presidents in the Lord'.¹⁰⁷

The Church manifests herself empirically in the eucharistic gathering where Christ is always present. For this reason the structure and order of the Church come from this gathering which contains in itself all the necessary foundations of the ecclesial organism. As this gathering without its president would be a formless mess, so the Church without the proestōs.

Eto označast, čto tam, gde poyavlyatsya mestnaya tserkov, tam odnovremenno sozdaetsya i služenie predstoyatelstva. Otsyuda vitekaet odno iz samikh osnovnikh položenii Evkharističeskoj ekkleziologii: bez služeniya predstoyatelstva ne možet bit mestnoi tserkvi, a potomu empiričeskim priznakom kafoličeskoj tserkvi yavlyatsya predstoyatel.¹⁰⁸

These crucial figures make their first discreet appearance in Paul's earliest letter at I Thessalonians 5,12 and Afanasev argues for their identification with the hēgoumenoi of Hebrews 13,24. Despite the terminological variability of the New Testament corpus, there is sufficient evidence to say that the New Testament churches enjoyed the services of 'presidents'. Their threefold work comprised firstly, presidency at the Eucharist; secondly, and flowing from this, the building up of the assembly by pastoral care; thirdly, teaching or responsibility for the faith proclaimed during the liturgical sunaxis. Afanasev holds that the fluctuation of language can be explained by contingent factors: e.g. because the

term hegoumenos might have connotations of coercive power in the Gentile world Paul avoided it in dealing with his Hellenistic churches, whereas for Jewish-Christians who were already aware that leadership was 'shepherding' it was quite safe, hence the use of Hebrews and Acts.¹⁰⁹ By this unifying if somewhat sweeping interpretation of the fragmentary New Testament evidence on the governance of the earliest churches, Afanasev has reached a content for the ministry of the 'presidents in the Lord' which can at once be identified with that of the historic episcopate of the Great Church.

But Afanasev cannot justify this inference except by coming to terms with the tangled issue of the 'presbyter-bishops' of the New Testament communities, and the process of differentiation which produced the classical 'threefold ministry' after the 'tunnel' of the sub-apostolic period. As far back as the Church can remember her own existence, Afanasev avers, she remembers that of the presbyter-bishops. He proposes that, in the earliest churches, presbyteroi and episkopoi were the same persons. They were, in fact, the proestōtes. By the most natural supposition, the difference of names reflects the distinction between Jewish-Christian (presbyteroi) and Gentile (episkopoi). In churches where presbyter-terminology was current, the term could englobe not only the proestōs but also the senior members of the community: in such cases where there was a need to be specific the term presiding presbyter (kathēstamenos presbuter) was invoked. Little by little the word presbuter came to designate uniquely those who had the office of proestōs, and then at a later stage, when the bishops differentiated themselves from among the general ranks of presbyter-bishops,

the 'second rank of priesthood'. The word episkopos came in, he thinks, to underline that aspect of the role of the proestōs which could be summed up as guardianship, guarding the orthodox faith and thereby the flock committed to the proestōs' charge. Afanasev proposes the hypothesis that this title is later than other appellations of the proestōs, such as presbyter, precisely because it presupposes the emergence of heresy.

So far, then, we have learned that the local church in the apostolic era was provided by its founder with proestotes, with a ministry of eucharistic presidency, pastorate and guardianship of doctrine; that such figures could be called indifferently 'presbyters' or 'bishops', but that owing to the exigencies of defending the faith the title bishop ('watchman') came to be the preferred title for the chief proestōs, the presiding presbyter. Afanasev now turns to what he calls the 'ministry of help', in Greek antilempsis. Without the proestōs no local church could exist for without him there is no eucharistic assembly; but where there is a eucharistic assembly there must be a ministry of help for the Church is based on agapē. The ministry of the Seven in the Jerusalem church was evidently of this kind, whether or no they are prototype deacons. In a lengthy excursus, Afanasev argues that the Seven were really prototype presbyters: it is in Philipians that we first hear of deacons in the proper sense, while in the Pastoral Epistles and Hippolytus they emerge as assistants to the bishop in the realm of active charity.¹¹⁰

How, from out of this complex picture, did the stark simplicity of the patristic 'monarchical episcopate' emerge? Under the heading prinosyaščii blagodarenie, 'he who gives thanks', Afanasev returns to the problem of the inter-relation

of proestós, presbyter and bishop from a fresh angle. In the Johannine Apocalypse, the image of heaven is that of the eucharistic assembly transposed to the court of God at the end of time.¹¹¹ The thrones of the elders (presbyters) correspond to the seats of the presbyter-proestōtes in the earthly church, but to what corresponds the throne of him who sits at the centre of the heavenly liturgy? According to Ignatius it is the chair of the bishop,¹¹² and yet in apostolic times there was no episcopate in the later monarchical sense, only the ministry of presbyter-bishops. But could there ever have been a eucharistic assembly without a central place? This question provides the fil conducteur for Afanasev's investigation of the origins of the episcopate. Around the middle of the second century, we find bishops whose ministry is becoming quite clearly differentiated from that of presbyters. Even if bishops are still called presbyters from time to time, presbyters are never called bishops. Great changes in organisation are afoot, though the absence of any signs of power-struggle confirms that their roots lie in tradition. How can this be explained? The Church was instituted in principle at the Last Supper, which was itself a chaburah meal like that of any Jewish household in its outer form, and included then its paterfamilias. That Church was actualised at Pentecost, whereupon the meal of the disciple-group became the eucharistic assembly. If we ask, Who at that assembly took the place of Jesus at the Last Supper, the answer must be that in the earliest community, the Jerusalem mother-church, this could only have been Peter, but Peter sharing the ministry of proestos with the other apostles by his side. There may be many proestotes, yet only one can 'give thanks'.

Tserkvi Božei vo Khriste 'prinosyaščii blagodarenii' dolžen bit odnim, a 'predstoyatelei v Gospode' neskolko.¹¹³

It is for this reason that the presbyterate can never have lacked its 'proto-presbyter'. Afanasev holds that in the mother-church, after the dispersal of the Twelve, the Seven took on the role of proestōtes with James at their head as 'he who gives thanks'. If this be so, then Paul and Barnabas, on the evidence of Acts, simply re-created in their churches the pattern of this archetype. Such an evolution would also suggest how Ignatius could see in the presbyters the 'senate' of the apostles.¹¹⁴ Here we have a hypothesis which appears genuinely to explain more than it assumes.

The 'protopresbyter' is, therefore, an important figure for Afanasev's reconstruction of the ministry in the early church. Although his existence is nowhere expressly alluded to, one cannot imagine the Church without a 'Jacobite' ministry where one presbyter is known to be ho prōtos, the eldest or first. Apart from this a priori consideration, Afanasev adduces four textually-based persuasive considerations. Firstly, without postulating this figure, it is hard to understand the primacy of James in the church of Jerusalem. Though he was the Lord's brother, any of the Twelve would have a better claim to leadership in the mother community. Secondly, the Third Letter of John implies a situation where a particular elder, 'the Elder', had oversight of doctrine in a given church: this looks like the 'proto-presbyter' Afanasev speaks of. Thirdly, the Prima Clementis lacks a self-description by its author, which can be explained on the supposition that he was the proto-presbyter of the Roman church, a church which was notoriously conservative

and kept to the vocabulary of Palestine even when the Corinthian community, being Pauline, used a more 'developed' vocabulary. It was the attempt to remove the proto-presbyter of the church in Corinth (however the latter was designated) which drew the concern of the Roman Christians. Fourthly, in Ignatius we have extraordinarily early the fully-fledged appearance of the monarchical bishop, extraordinary considering how brief an interval separates Ignatius from Clement. The easiest explanation is that the Ignatian episcopate was founded on the earlier and universal proto-presbyterate. Finally in First Peter, the apostle describes himself as sumpresbuteros: he is both one elder among others, and also the head of a local church. The continued vitality of this language is attested by its application even in the third century to the bishops.¹¹⁵

Afanasev regards Ignatius as the crucial catalyst in the transformation of proto-presbyter into monarchical bishop. The success of his visionary re-casting of the ministry must have depended in practice on the reaction of the Roman church. Had that church rejected the Ignatian view of the episcopate as a distinct ministry, then it would have remained simply a provincial current in Syria. Ignatius himself appreciated the importance of Rome as the church that presides in love: he also knew that she did not see her own proto-presbyter as a bishop. From a testimony of Irenaeus in Eusebius' History as well as from the Secunda Clementis it seems that Rome saw her proestōs as a proto-presbyter well after 150.¹¹⁶ In retrospect, however, she began to see them as bishops, and so the doctrine of the apostolic succession emerges: the dignity of pontifex in the Christian community passes from Christ to the bishops by the

mediation of the apostles. This concept appears at very much the same time in a tremendously extended geographical space: with Hegesippus in Palestine, Polycarp in Asia Minor, Epiphanius in Cyprus, Jerome in Italy, the Didascalia of Addai in Syria.¹¹⁷ Ignatius' doctrine was not simply the fruit of theological speculation; had it been only this it could never have achieved such success. It corresponded to the vital needs of the Church in that epoch. The menace to the authority of the proto-presbyters was clear in the Johannine letters, in the Prima Clementis and in First Peter. Montanism provoked a yet more precise formulation of the episcopal ministry. The Church took from Judaism the idea of a divinely instituted sacred organisation. The ministry of the episcopal pontifex could now be traced back to Christ without the mediation of the eucharistic assembly, and this was the doctrine that endured, not Ignatius'. Nevertheless, Afanasev thinks the application of the imagery of high-priesthood to the bishop was not any great danger in itself. The perilous element was the notion that it was because he was Christ's high priest that he acted as proestōs of the local church (and not the other way round). The proto-presbyter's authority was eucharistic; now it is episcopal, quasi-territorial. Bishops proceeded to delegate presbyters to preside in auxiliary liturgical centres (parishes), although once again Rome in its conservatism construed this as simply an enlargement of the space of the principal eucharistic assembly, as the liturgical practice of the fermentum eloquently testifies.¹¹⁸

Thus Afanasev's account of the emergence of the historic episcopate ends with a discussion of the concept of 'apostolic succession'. The idea of paradōsis is abundantly present in

the early Church, and it implies the existence of people entrusted with the conserving of tradition. The Pastoral Epistles show the apostles transmitting their own function in this regard to local churches where tradition is to be kept intact thanks to the succession and continuity of those whose duty it is to guard it.¹¹⁹ This paradōsis could be guarded in different ways. In Clement of Alexandria we hear of a succession of teachers: this disappeared early, perhaps because it resembled too much the procedures of Gnostic groups.¹²⁰ In Origen we find a spiritual hierarchy of teachers of the Word, distinct from the normal ecclesiastical hierarchy; Montanists too were perhaps familiar with the notion of a succession of prophets in the Great Church.¹²¹ For Afanasev the reason the Church rejected an apostolic succession via didaskaloi or prophets in favour of a succession via presbyter-bishops was that the latter were prior in time and prior in significance. The notion of succession via teachers and prophets presupposes the existence of an international church body, since such teachers and prophets could not be counted on to appear to order within a given local church. But this concept of an international church body is, Afanasev maintains, utterly foreign to earliest Christianity. By contrast, the mediation of the apostolic succession through presbyter-bishops follows quite logically from the original structure of the Church as a communion of local churches each consisting of a eucharistic assembly with its president.

Afanasev does not hold, therefore, that the apostles directly established bishops but that they - or persons authorised by them - appointed presbyter-bishops among whom

one proestos, 'he who gives thanks', originally proto-presbyter and then bishop, took first place. When it came to be thought desirable to concretise the doctrine of apostolic succession in a list of names, this list reached no further back than the presbyter-bishops whose succession guaranteed that of other presbyters. Around the middle years of the second century, however, the entire story of the handing on of faith and order became telescoped. The high-priestly dignity, as understood through typological exegesis of the Old Testament, was described as conferred by Christ on the apostles at the Last Supper and on the bishops after them at the moment of their appointment to the apostolic ministry. From that date onwards, the names of the apostles could be placed at the heads of the lists of bishops. This is a particular concern of Irenaeus, mainly in the context of guarding the apostolic doctrine against the Gnostics.¹²² Irenaeus might have chosen to try and produce such a list for every local church but that of Rome could suffice for all. The Roman church made Irenaeus' doctrine its own, probably because it had it implicitly anyway and all he contributed was its formulation.¹²³

III. A fundamental ecclesiology

Afanasev's brief fundamental ecclesiology which concludes Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo has the characteristic title Vlast lyubvi 'the power of love'. Distinctions of a negative kind arise within the Church's common life, Afanasev maintains, when 'empirical', empiričeskoe, principles replace truly 'ecclesial', tserkovnoe, ones. Empirical factors probably unavoidable in a given historical epoch get taken up into the very texture of

the Church's life - as the shadow of Byzantium follows Eastern Orthodoxy even today. Our time, he insists, requires the elimination of such elements: firstly, to free the genuinely ecclesial principles for their own proper operation, and, secondly, to allow fresh empirical factors to 'regenerate the historical moment' in the Church, i.e. to give her the power to address her contemporaries effectively. We cannot return to the primitive Church; nevertheless it must be our criterion because of its peculiar transience to the founding grace of the New Testament.

Tem ne menea, vremya pervogo khrisianstva staetsya dlya nas idealnim, po kotoroma mi dolzhi proveriat našu tserkovnuyu žizn, t.k. esto bilo vremya v žizni tserkvi, kogda ee priroda s soveršennoi yasnostyn prosveščivala skvoz ee istoričeskuyu tkan.¹²⁴

The organising principle in the Church is the Holy Spirit, and this fact of itself excludes any other principle exterior to the Church from becoming her structuring form. Canon law, certainly, cannot be such a form: the notion that without canons there would be anarchy is wholly alien to the ancient church. In becoming Christian the Roman emperor did not cease to be Caesar, nor could he undo the role of law without undoing the pax romana itself. Not all post-Constantinian Christians, however, accepted the concept of the Roman empire as civitas christianorum. Praise is due to Augustine of Hippo for resisting this temptation. In the Byzantine East, however, a Eusebian theology appeared to annul the distance between God and his imperial vicegerent. In 'ecclesialising' law as 'canon law' the Church attempted an impossible synthesis between law and grace. For

some, the Church militant needs the law which the Church triumphant transcends. But there is only one Church in heaven and on earth. In the secular context, law in its negative aspect of forbidding what is unjust is innocuous, though even there in its positive aspect it tends to exalt the State above the person. By its tendency to become universal without and global within - i.e. imperial and omni-competent - the State is ever faced by the totalitarian temptation. The Church can never recognise a State which falls victim to this temptation and enslaves the individual person, albeit for the most sublime ends, even if such a State lay claim to the name of Christian. On the other hand, she may recognise a secular constitutional state, where the rule of law does not claim omni-competence in all spheres. But she must reject law within her own domain: in the charismatic order of agape the person does not need law's protection. But in an important footnote, Afanasev makes it clear that he is not hostile to the sheer existence of normative principles for the common life of the Church, but only to their interpretation as law in however analogical a sense.

Suščestvovanie prava v Tserkvi otritsaetsya s točki z zreniya yuridičeskoj i bogoslovskoj. Dlya menya zdes eti osnovaniya ne imeyut značeniya. Samo saboyu razumeetsya, što otsutstvie pravovikh norm v Tserkvi ne označacet otsutstvuya v nei kakikh libo pravil religipuyuščikh ee žizn. Vopros idet ne o suščestvovanio norm v Tserkvi, a ob ikh prirode.¹²⁵

The agapeistic life, the sacrifice of self in the name of Christ, is a renunciation of the individual rights which people rightly claim in the empirical life of secular society. The

Sermon on the Mount is the Church's charter: love does not need law. The love freed into the world by the Spirit creates a communion where one does not say 'I' but always 'we'. From the time of Constantine on, however, the authority of the bishops has been based on law, and thereby all organisation and administration too. For the primitive church, on the other hand, the authority of the bishop derives solely from the eucharistic assembly; for authority is a ministry and there can be no ministry not rooted in the local church. Christian ministry is the expression of the kenotic love of the Son of God, whose service of his brethren remains the icon of all ministry: obrazom etikh služenii.¹²⁶ Only a diversity in charismatic gift creates differentiation of ministry in the Church, and all charisms, and therefore all ministries, have their origin and end in love. If the episcopal ministry is the most important of all ministries this must be because it is the representation and manifestation of the power of love. The bishop's authority is, then, the authority of love, and because love gives itself his relation with the faithful is one of mutual submission in love. This is the form of the apostolic ministry; its content is loving power to gain all men for Christ.

B. The Table of the Lord (1952)

If Afanasev's account of the development of the 'catholic' pattern of Church life is supple and nuanced, it is nevertheless based on a single organising idea whose implications for both ecclesiology and ecclesial practice are far-reaching. The

attempt to infer the structure of the Church from the shape of the eucharistic assembly provides Afanasev with a criterion for judging the way in which the 'mystical' reality of the Church - to use the language of 'Državna vlast na vasselenskim saborima' - expresses itself concretely. The insistence that the tangible forms of the Church's life must be intelligible in terms of the Eucharist leads him to resolve his hesitation about both the imperial institution and the canons, two vital features of the patristic Church, with a resounding 'No'. In Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo Afanasev calls his ecclesiology 'eucharistic ecclesiology'. In Trapeza Gospodnya he throws further light on the Eucharist itself. Though this work would more naturally be classified as an essay in sacramental theology, because of the peculiar nature of Afanasev's approach to the Church it must be considered here as well.¹²⁷

Trapeza Gospodnya has three themes: the Eucharistic assembly, its circumstances and unity; Eucharistic celebration, by bishops, presbyters and people; Eucharistic communion, participation at 'the table of the Lord'. Afanasev describes this essay as an attempt to elucidate some principles of eucharistic ecclesiology, principles which find their expression in liturgical life and serve as criteria for the health of that life. In this way, Afanasev hopes to contribute to the theology of the liturgy, and so provide a basis on which to answer questions de actualité in a debate over forms of worship. He describes the present state of the Orthodox liturgy as the result of a complex historical process in which much is that was not, and much is not that was. He wishes to distinguish, therefore, between what is neizmennii, 'invariable', in the Liturgy from what has

'come to penetrate it in a contingent fashion in the course of time': to čto slučaino v nee proniklo. This manner of posing the problem reflects his earlier approach to both Councils and canons, but in this third area of investigation his language takes on a new intensity. By the Holy Spirit, Christ's parousia is realised in the Eucharist which becomes thereby both holy assembly, sobranie, and the banquet of the essay's title. In approaching liturgical reform metanoia is the essential pre-condition of success. Afanasev clearly indicates, however, the concrete direction in which such reform should take place. The Orthodox must, above all, recover the awareness that their life and activity is obšee delo, a 'common affair'. And bringing together references from Acts, First Corinthians and Ignatius, he finds the key to ecclesial consciousness in the notion of epi to auto, 'gathering as one'. Surmounting present-day individualism will not, he predicts, be easy, but then again, it is never easy to enter the 'ecumenical spaciousness', vselenskie prostori, of the Church's life.¹²⁸

In the patristic Church, from Justin to Denys, the Eucharist can be referred to as hē sunaxis, sobranie since on the sun's day, when Christ rose again, the primitive community 'assembled' for a single Eucharistic celebration, lacking as they did all sense that a limited group of the Church's members could gather separately for the liturgy. For the earliest Church, Church and Eucharistic assembly were inextricably interwoven:

Gde Evkharističeskoe sobranie, tam Tserkov, i gde
Tserkov, tam Evkharističeskoe sobranie.¹²⁹

Only the gradual invasion of Church structures by the Greco-Roman idea of the polis or civitas could threaten this original

eucharistic ecclesiology. In the 'church-city' of an urban see, the bishop came eventually to have charge of a series of eucharistic assemblies, presided over by presbyters in the bishop's name. In a collision of mutually exclusive organising principles, the polis met and displaced a Eucharistically-based sense of the Church. In the time of Ignatius, however, the chasm between the city bishop and the Eucharistic principle had not yet opened. In establishing the unity of the bishop's church Ignatius establishes simultaneously the unity of the Eucharistic gathering. Though scholars frequently regard Ignatius' Church practice as atypical of its period: if this were so, the later universal adoption of the monepiscopate would be inexplicable. Afanasev suggests that the predominant attitude of the ante-Nicene church to change is summed up in a phrase of Stephen I: nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est. However, his own position turns out to be somewhat more nuanced than this. Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo had described the episcopate as something less than a direct apostolic creation. Here, too, Afanasev presents Ignatius' teaching on the inter-relation of Church, Eucharist and bishop as an attempt to guard the inherited tradition by the invoking of what was, in part, a personal content. But whatever novel elements there may be in the Syrian monarchical episcopate as understood by Ignatius, the coinherence of Church, Eucharist and proestōs is fundamental to both apostolic and sub-apostolic times.

The eucharistic assembly is the assembly of all in a single place for one and the same end. The divine gathering activity, vis-à-vis mankind, is achieved through the Eucharistic convocatio. Afanasev insists that this maxim governed the entire practice of

the early Church. Indeed, he describes the question as to whether in earliest Christianity the local church had one single eucharistic celebration as not only the fundamental question of eucharistic ecclesiology but 'the question on which all understanding of the history and organisation of the Church depends': vopros ot kotorogo zavisiť ponimanie istorii tserkvi i ee ustroistva. For liberal theology, such an approach is incomprehensible: to liberals, Spirit and Church organisation are opposed quantities. Liberalnoe bogoslovie takes primitive Christianity to be eschatological not simply in its objective thought, insofar as it expected the speedy advent of the Messiah, but also in its subjective thought, in that its self-understanding was eschatological through and through. This being so, the primitive Church could scarcely have paid attention to forms of earthly organisation. But, Afanasev objects, the opposition of Spirit and porjadka, 'order', or čina, 'rank', is not only 'imaginary', mnimim, but frankly 'unintelligible', neponyatnim. It derives from the presumption that the origin of organisation can only be human will, volya, whereas the Spirit is associated with a 'blessed anarchy', blagodatnuyu anarkhiyu. On such a (quite groundless) supposition, order or 'form', stroj, can only appear in the Church when its charismatic character is fading and its parousial hope on the wane. In fact, however, the gathering together of two or three in the logion of Matthew must be read in the light of the Spirit's descent at Pentecost when the promise of the Last Supper became actual.

V Tserkvi Dukh est organizuyuščee načalo, t.k., v Dukhe i čerez Dukha obščestvo pervikh khristian stalo Tserkovnuyu.¹³⁰

The unity of the eschatological and organisational aspects of the Church is pneumatic or Pentecostal: Pentecost is simultaneously the anticipation, predvoskhishchenie, of the Parousia and the realisation of the Supper community in the Eucharistic assembly. Afanasev may thus return to his original 'fundamental question' about the unity or plurality of celebration in the churches of New Testament times.

His discussion centres on the concept of 'house-churches'. He argues that in both Acts and the Pauline corpus what is in question is not, strictly speaking, an ecclesia domestica, domashnyaya tserkov, but only the Church as gathered in a house: tserkov sobrannaya v dome. Though the Jerusalem church in particular clearly met in houses, such meetings were gatherings of the whole church. The idea of the domestic ecclesiola is blagočestii mif, 'a pious myth'. Though the council in Trullo sanctioned genuine house-churches, with the consent of the local bishop, they are, Afanasev concludes, a product of the post-Nicene era. The custom of the fermentum in the Roman church confirms this. The church of Rome, which was conservative in outlook, was anxious to preserve the idea of the single Eucharist of the local community even when numbers forced it to permit the celebration of the liturgy at a variety of centres. The one eucharistic assembly is the principle of unity both for the local church and for the whole Church of God, for in each local community that Church resides in all its fulness.

Turning now to the 'con-celebration' of the Eucharist by bishop, presbyters and people Afanasev rehearses many of the themes and material already explored in the account given here of Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo. He places the Eucharistic assembly,

with its various ministries, in its architectural setting. Considering the roles of proestōs, presbyters and deacons in Justin's church, Afanasev points out that the Roman house was perfectly fitted for the Christian Eucharist. As the Church's members gathered in the atrium, the paterfamilias took up his place at the tablinum. To his side, where senior figures of the household would sit, were places for the presbyters. As always, the president is the centre of Afanasev's attention in matters of the ministry: he it is who gathers the people of God for the service of God. Afanasev shows particular interest here in the process by which, as the ante-Nicene period drew to its close, the bishop's task of eucharistic presidency devolved on the presbyter in detached 'parish' congregations of the local church.¹³¹

The closing section of the study, on koinōnia in the Eucharistic Gifts, is a plea for a restoration not only of frequent communion but of the full participation of the people in the common liturgy which the ministry does not possess but rather serves. Utilising a good deal of the material already surveyed in Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo Afanasev's writing here shares much of the same concerns as the 'Liturgical Movement' which began in the Latin Church on the eve of the Great War and had reached considerable maturity, both in the theoretical and the practical domains, by the 1950's.¹³²

C. Further ecclesiological soundings (1949-1966)

In this section a number of post-war ecclesiological essays on various themes will be considered together. Afanasev's

established principles and motifs will be seen to recur, though deployed in what are sometimes fresh contexts. In 'L'Eglise de Dieu dans le Christ' Afanasev offered a re-statement of the foundations of eucharistic ecclesiology seen as a key notion for interpreting the Pauline corpus.¹³³ While through baptism a man is introduced into the unité ontologique of the body of Christ, full agrégation to the Church is achieved only through participation in the Eucharist. In the ontological similarity but empirical diversity of those so aggregated there is hiérarchie des ministères but no hiérarchie des membres.¹³⁴ Afanasev regards Jesus' promise to Peter in Matthew 16,18 as a prediction that the Eucharist will continue to be celebrated until the Parousia. Since where the Eucharist is offered the Church is manifested in plenitude, such a prediction necessarily entails that pulai hadou ou katischusousin autēs (tēs ekklēsiās).¹³⁵ Here Afanasev's rediscovery of Ignatian catholicity is fleshed out with the fuller material he had gathered from his investigations into early Church and ministry, as well as his exploration of the Eucharist.

The Ignatian concept of universality, as interpreted by Afanasev, is the dominant concern of 'Kafoličeskaya Tserkov'.¹³⁶ Here, in 1957, we find an echo of a new concern with the Papacy, so important as to require a section to itself. Afanasev now considers that Ignatius' vision of the Church cannot be described without serious attention to the unique place of the Roman community in the communion of the churches. The inscription of Ignatius' letter to the Romans does not simply ascribe to that community a presiding role among the churches of central Italy, as Afanasev appeared to have believed at the time of writing

chapter 7 of Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo. Ignatius saw the Roman church as enjoying a double presidency, one among the suburbicarian sees, the other in the universal circle of all Christian assemblies.¹³⁷

Unfortunately, the Ignatian ecclesiology is hardly represented by the practice of either Orthodox or Catholic churches in the contemporary world. Among the Orthodox, so Afanasev argues in 'Le sacrement de l'assemblée', the idea of the mystic sacrifice has come to displace that of Eucharistic assembly.¹³⁸ Because in the Byzantine liturgy the sacrificial moment does not occupy, historically, the central place in the Eucharistic prayer, misguided liturgical sentiment has tried to 'remedy' the situation. This it has done by creating the rite of proskomidia which Afanasev tartly describes as 'un acte sacramentel séparé, un acte qui répond bien plus à la vie liturgique contemporaine que l'Eucharistie proprement dite'. Judging by its content, the proskomidia is the sacrament of the Sacrifice: hence after the Great Entry the troparion of Good Friday is sung. But this ruptures the Eucharistic rite: the words of institution cease to be the anamnēsis of the Last Supper and become those of the institution of the sacrifice of the New Covenant. Afanasev does not at all wish to deny the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, but rather to give that character its proper context.

La ségrégation du sacrifice en un acte sacramental isolé affaiblissait singulièrement la nature de l'Eucharistie, en tant qu'assemblée des fidèles réunis pour célébrer le repas du Seigneur. Séparé des autres aspects de l'Eucharistie, le moment sacrificiel perd son caractère ecclésiologique, et il en est de même pour l'Eucharistie elle-même.¹³⁹

The lack of a sense that all should communicate in the fruits of the sacrifice is the inevitable result. Afanasev ends his essay with an appeal to Ignatius of Antioch's letter to the Ephesians. Relying on C. Maurer's interpretation of that letter in his Ignatius von Antiochen und das Johannes-evangelium, Afanasev argues that the pharmakon athanasias which makes Christians live for ever in Christ is not simply, for Ignatius, the eucharistic elements but is the assembly itself.¹⁴⁰

The distortions of Eucharistic consciousness among contemporary Catholics are set forth in Statio orbis in connexion with the institution of 'eucharistic congresses'.¹⁴¹ The liturgical historian J.A. Jungmann had proposed an original theology of this phenomenon of modern Catholicism.¹⁴² The idea that the Eucharistic congress is a kind of universal Eucharist, a statio orbis, is described by Afanasev as the most important thesis of Eucharistic theology so far offered within the framework of a universalist ecclesiology. It depends on an analogy between the statio urbis in the ancient Roman church, and the modern phenomenon. Afanasev points out that the statio urbis was itself a significant step away from primitive practice:

Dans la pratique du fermentum, on met l'accent sur l'unité de l'Eucharistie, qui présuppose l'unicité de l'évêque. Un peu plus tard apparaît la pratique de la statio urbis, dans laquelle l'accent est transféré sur l'unicité de l'évêque dans les limites de l'église locale, unicité qui présuppose l'unité idéale de l'assemblée eucharistique.¹⁴³

This principle of the bishop's unicity was undermined by, on the one hand, the practice of creating titular and auxiliary bishops, and, on the other, by the celebration of the Eucharist by presbyters. But at least the latter can only celebrate with the permission of the diocesan. The mind of the Church

preserved the principle that no bishop, no eucharistic assembly (and vice versa). But if we attempt to apply Eucharistic ecclesiological thinking to the Church conceived as universal we shall end up, once again, with the idea of a universal pastor.

L'application du principe de l'unité de l'assemblée eucharistique à l'écclésiologie universelle nous amène inévitablement à postuler l'unicité de l'évêque dans l'Eglise universelle. L'évêque universelle ne peut être qu'unique, autrement nous devrions renoncer au principe de l'unicité de l'évêque dans l'Eglise. Pour paradoxale qu'elle paraisse, cette idée est cependant la conclusion logique de la doctrine de l'Eglise universelle. Idéalement il ne peut exister dans l'Eglise qu'une seule assemblée eucharistique, ayant à sa tête un évêque; mais empiriquement ce n'est pas une assemblée, c'est toute une multitude d'assemblées. Ce dernier fait ne peut pas servir d'argument contre l'existence d'une assemblée eucharistique universelle. A une certaine époque ... de nombreuses assemblées eucharistiques ont fait leur apparition dans les églises locales à côté de l'assemblée principale, c'est-à-dire l'assemblée épiscopale.¹⁴⁴

For Jungmann, Afanasev concludes, it seems that the pope is such a bishop. The introduction of eucharistic ecclesiology into a universalist ecclesiology produces a universal-pontifical in place of a universal-episcopal ecclesiology. The other bishops are reduced to a papal presbyterium. Is not this why Gregory the Great proscribed the terms 'universal bishop' or 'ecumenical bishop'? In any case, the statio orbis is a fiction: there cannot be real participation of all members of the Church. How can there be an ecclesiological basis for the assertion that the pope is the bishop of the universal Church, if that Church has no assembly?

Afanasev remained exercised, not only by the liturgical misconceptions of Orthodox and Catholics in their approach to

the Eucharist, but to what he saw as their ecclesiological misunderstanding of the Church's unity in the episcopate. The divided traditions had lost their hold not only on the assembly but also on its proestōs. In the East, the distortion concerned episcopal conciliarity, in the West, collegiality.

In the East, so Afanasev pointed out in 'Le concile dans la théologie orthodoxe russe', the fifth canon of Nicaea had apparently envisaged a council for a metropolitan region which would be an assembly of bishops.¹⁴⁵ But in its fourth canon, Nicaea seems to speak, in connexion with the ordination of bishops, not so much of a council as of an ecclesial assembly of the local church enriched by the participation of the bishops of other local churches of a province. The view that bishops ought to be elected by the council of a metropolitan region was first clearly articulated in the nineteenth canon of the 341 council of Antioch. Afanasev warns, however, that in 404, when an attempt was made to secure the condemnation of John Chrysostom by appeal to another canon of that council he was defended by the argument that the Antiochene council was Arian. At the time of Nicaea, thought a universalist ecclesiology had begun to penetrate into the mind of the Church, the particularist ecclesiology was still in possession - not least at that Council itself.

Bien qu'à l'époque du concile de Nicée l'ecclésiologie universelle ait déjà pénétré dans la conscience ecclésiastique, ce type d'ecclésiologie n'a pas encore eu le temps de prendre la place du type primitif de l'ecclésiologie, selon lequel chaque église locale est autonome et indépendante. Il est bien évident que le concile de Nicée n'avait pas en vue de supprimer l'indépendance de l'église locale; au contraire, il cherchait à la conserver dans les conditions nouvelles

de la vie de l'Eglise. Pour ce concile, ni le métropolite, ni le concile de la région métropolitaine n'étaient les représentants d'un pouvoir suprême auquel auraient été soumises les églises locales.¹⁴⁶

It is true that Constantinople I in its sixth canon speaks of a 'greater council', meizōn sunodos, of the civil diocese. Russian theology, reports Afanasev, tends to see here the patriarchate of the future. But this is doubtful. It is the same old council of the province, with the participation of other bishops from the same civil diocese. He concludes that those forms of ecclesial organisation which Orthodoxy now knows, the patriarchates and autocephalous churches, go beyond the limits of the decisions of the ecumenical councils. Looking to that patriarchate and autocephaly he knew best, Afanasev presents the history of synodal self-government in the church of Russia in extremely bleak terms. The very idea of an autocephalous church involves transposing the primitive qualities of the local church, indépendance, autonomie, to up-graded metropolitan regions. The Sobor of 1917, in providing the Russian church with an ecclesial assembly, introduced the idea of representation, itself juridical rather than theological in character. This Afanasev stigmatises as 'une véritable aberration de la pensée théologique', lamenting that the autocephalous principle it was meant to serve had destroyed the sense of Orthodoxy's common ecclesial mind.

Malheureusement, le séparatisme ecclésial a tellement pris racine dans l'Eglise orthodoxe que chaque église autocéphale vit de sa propre vie, sans regard sur les autres.¹⁴⁷

Yet to appeal to the authority of the universal episcopate in council would be to cure one disease by spreading another.

The thesis that an ecumenical council is the supreme bearer of authority to govern and teach in the Church is simply a piece of Catholic Scholasticism. For Afanasev, the Church's indefectibility in truth resides only in the coincidence of witness in the constituent churches of the union of love, a theme further explored in his contribution to the 1961 Chevetogne 'journées oecuméniques', on infallibility.¹⁴⁸

Afanasev takes equal offence at the Western idea of collegiality, currently emerging as the means of a redistribution of forces between the Roman bishop and the rest in the Latin church. In 'Réflexions d'un orthodoxe sur la collégialité des évêques', he admits that the emergence of the doctrine of episcopal collegiality at the Second Vatican Council testifies to 'l'énergie créatrice de la pensée catholique'.¹⁴⁹ But while Orthodox theologians have greeted it with a certain sympathy, they are far from sharing the enthusiasm of their Catholic colleagues. Though the notion of collegiality has certain elements found in Orthodoxy, in itself it is absent from Orthodox theology. The concept of episcopal collegiality postulates a parallelism between the 'college of apostles' and the 'college of bishops'. One's first task, therefore, is to ask whether these two colleges have existed. Collegium is a juridical notion: and whatever view one has about the introduction of law into the sphere of the Church, one can hardly retroject it to the life-time of Jesus and his disciples. Afanasev maintains that the relations between Jesus and the disciples can be understood historically in terms of two models: that of the rabbinate, and that of the chaburah. Neither had the least trace of a juridical character. If a college of

apostles existed after Pentecost, it never manifested itself in any concrete way. (Afanasev leaves aside, as too historically debatable, the 'apostolic council' of Acts 15). The 'college of bishops' is equally dubious. By what means did the college of apostles transmit their authority to this second college? Afanasev finds it easier to credit the idea that Peter's ecclesial authority was passed to the Roman bishop than he does the notion that the college of apostles as a whole passed theirs to the college of bishops as a whole. But allowing for the moment the truth of the hypothesis, datum non concessum, how is this episcopal collegiality supposed to have shown itself? The only possible answer is in terms of councils. But so far as the historian can tell, the local council is Cyprianic in origin, the ecumenical imperial. Neither has a soundly-established pedigree, and in the case of the latter the results of the conciliar institution were to introduce as much division as union into the episcopate and thence into the Church: episcopal collegiality is an ideal which has yet to find its historical realisation.

But Afanasev's principal objection to the collegiality thesis concerns its implications for the fundamental doctrine of the Church. Historically, it has been more usual for local churches to claim succession to a particular apostle (frequently, one must admit, in a legendary or semi-legendary way). Nowhere is this clearer than in the case of the Church of Rome.

Si même on accepte l'existence d'une forme collective de la succession apostolique, comment expliquer que l'église de Rome conserve la forme individuelle de cette succession?

Afanasev prefers his own theory of apostolic succession, whereby

the bishop of each local church occupies the cathedra Petri, since that 'chair' is the 'première chaire' of the first eucharistic assembly in Jerusalem.

Tous ceux qui ont occupé ou qui occupent une chaire dans n'importe quelle assemblée eucharistique, sont les successeurs de Pierre quant à sa chaire. S'il est permis de tirer des conclusions de cette doctrine, il faut admettre que non seulement chaque évêque, mais aussi les apôtres, quand ils présidaient une assemblée eucharistique, occupaient aussi la chaire de Pierre.¹⁵⁰

Moreover, the theory put forward by the Second Vatican Council cannot lead, despite its best intentions, to a genuine solution of the problem of the equilibrium between pope and bishops. The pope is declared by Lumen Gentium to belong to the college of bishops by being its head. According to the notae explicativae, while the college exists continuously, it does not permanently act in a strictly collegial way. It so acts during councils, and these cannot act against the pope, nor, according to the Codex Juris Canonici, should they be recognised without his confirmation, nor, once again according to a nota explicativa are they bound to be held, for the Roman bishop may act directly by virtue of his authority as pastor of the Universal Church, if the 'good of the Church' requires this. In other words:

entre les conciles, la collégialité des évêques se trouve dans un état d'anabiose et elle ne peut en sortir que sur le désir du pape.¹⁵¹

Afanasev proceeds to deal with the 'practical consequences' of the collegiality doctrine: namely, the foundation of an international synod to advise the Roman pope, and the creation of national episcopal conferences. With regard to the first, likening the international Synod to a (patriarchal) sunodos

endémousa in the East, he questions whether such a synod is really an expression of the collegiality doctrine, and also expresses certain reservations about its utility. By means of the synod, the pope will hear the opinions of individual bishops, but not of the whole college, and it is essential to the doctrine of collegiality that the episcopate must act as an integral whole. Furthermore, the Eastern experience of patriarchal synods has not been altogether happy. The synods were often either playthings of the patriarchs or in conflict with them. Again, the lengthy and repeated absence from the diocese which they entailed for their bishop members was bad. Finally, they did not succeed in whittling down the curial administration of the patriarch.

Ainsi le patriarche de Constantinople avait sa curie, très puissante, les autres patriarches des curies de bien moindre importance. Au douzième siècle, Balsamon comparait les archontes de Constantinople, qui étaient pour la plupart du temps des diacres, aux cardinaux romains. L'un d'eux, le chartofilax, premier ministre auprès du patriarche, occupait, du point de vue honorifique, une place supérieure à celle des métropolitains.¹⁵²

As to the national councils these are, Afanasev alleges, in effect regional councils which may serve as a first stage towards the formation of national churches. He expresses himself as unreservedly hostile to the notion of a national church.

le principe national, s'il ne rompe pas l'unité externe de l'Eglise, l'affaiblit dans une large mesure, de sorte que cette unité ne trouve plus son expression.

The concept of autocephaly in Orthodoxy is based merely on that of nationhood, and thus, in a broad sense, on political considerations. The system of ecclesiastical regions diminishes the independence of dioceses, and the links between diocesan

churches and the Roman church. Afanasev finds it not surprising that animus against it is said to exist in the Roman curia. Moreover, it is not really an example of collegiality in the sense intended by the Council.

... la formation de conciles régionaux n'est pas liée à la doctrine de la collégialité épiscopale: c'est plutôt, au contraire, une limitation du principe de la collégialité.¹⁵³

Thus while Afanasev welcomed the advent of the collegiality idea insofar as it involves a renunciation of the notion of local bishops as vice-gerents of the pope, it was disagreeable to him as yet another instance of a universalist ecclesiology. In a lucid summary of his own eucharistic ecclesiology, he hints that the Petrine primacy of the Roman church and bishop, dogmatised for Catholics in the document Pastor aeternus of the First Vatican Council, might be acceptable to the Orthodox if formulated in its terms.

Though we shall return to this dominant motif of Afanasev's last years in the closing section of this chapter, an account of his post-war 'ecclesiological soundings' should note that as early as 1949 he had divined the significance of his 'Cyprianic'/'Ignatian' distinction for Christian unity.¹⁵⁴ In 'Granitsi Tserkvi' Afanasev proposed that the triumph of a Cyprianic mode of ecclesiological thinking in the East had generated an irresoluble theological problem: that of the limits of the Church. He points out that, though from earliest times the sacraments of baptism, chrismation and the Eucharist have provided the means of initiating pagans into the Church, neither the practice nor the theory of the Church has been

consistent in the matter of the reconciliation of heretics and schismatics. The possibility of identifying vestigiae Ecclesiae outside the visible boundaries of the universal Church was offered in the Western tradition by Augustine's doctrine of the sacraments, and notably his distinction between validity, which the sacramental celebrations of schismatics might enjoy, and liceity, exclusively reserved to the Catholic communion. But in the East the problem of the reality of schismatic sacraments remained an open question. Neither rigorist, kat' akribeian, attitudes nor liberal, kat' oikonomian, ones can offer an adequate self-justification in either theological or canonical terms. The contradictions of Orthodox practice in regard to the reception of non-Orthodox Christians into the Orthodox Church display the ecumenical helplessness of a theological culture which has accepted the presuppositions of Cyprianic ecclesiology.¹⁵⁵ His own re-statement of the issue in terms not of a single, visibly united Church whose detached portions retain ecclesial trace-elements but of churches in ruptured communion would be subtitled 'en mémoire de Jean XXIII, le pape de l'amour'.¹⁵⁶

D. Peter and the Roman bishop 1955-1960

Afanasev's interest in Orthodox-Catholic rapprochement and, in particular, in the possible sense that the Orthodox might give to the 'Petrine ministry' of the bishop of Rome, was stimulated by the appearance of Oscar Cullmann's notable study, Saint Pierre, Disciple-Apôtre-Martyr, published concurrently at Neuchâtel and Paris in 1952. His first essay on the problem of the Papacy is in fact an extended review of Cullmann's book,

under the title Ap. Petr i Rimskii episkop.¹⁵⁷ Further ecclesiological reflections are to be found in an essay in the journal Istina two years later, 'La doctrine de la primauté à la lumière de l'ecclésiologie',¹⁵⁸ while in 1960 there appeared (and was quickly translated into English, German and Italian) the essay 'L'église qui préside dans l'amour', a contribution to the symposium La primauté de Pierre dans l'Eglise Orthodoxe.¹⁵⁹ We are dealing here, therefore, with a specific phase of Afanasev's writing, a phase concentrated on the problem of Orthodoxy's response to the Papacy, the absent patriarch of the West. This phase is treated here in its own right, since the ideas it produced will focus the final evaluation in this thesis of the importance of Afanasev's ecclesiology in the context of the Orthodox-Catholic dialogue opened in Patmos by representatives of the two communions in 1980.

Afanasev welcomed Cullmann's Peter study as, in the words of the simultaneously issued French version of his essay, 'un véritable événement dans la littérature théologique'. Though principally a contribution to the study of Christian origins it cannot but be of relevance as well to the quest for unity among divided Christians. Afanasev does not review the argument of the entire book, but concentrates on what he takes to be its central thesis: Peter as rock, and the ecclesiological implications thereof. And referring to the choice of a eucharistic over against a universalist ecclesiology, he sets out his aims by saying:

J'espère montrer que les considérations sur Pierre en tant que roc, ainsi que sur la succession apostolique et, en particulier sur la succession de l'évêque de

Rome varient considérablement, si l'on estime que c'est l'un ou l'autre type d'ecclésiologie qui se trouve être apparu le premier.¹⁶⁰

Cullmann himself assumes the universal ecclesiology now established in Catholic circles - as the frequency of the term 'église universelle' in his book amply shows. It forms, Afanasev alleges, a kind of a priori structure through which Cullmann approaches the crucial text, Matthew 16,17-18. Afanasev agrees with Cullmann that Jesus during his earthly ministry was perfectly capable of speaking about a church: using some Aramaic equivalent of Matthew's word ekklēsia, perhaps gehalla, kenishta or zibbura. The exact word hardly matters: what counts is its content, which is drawn from the Old Testament idea of the people of God. But in Jesus' use that idea is transformed. As Cullmann writes:

Il apporte ... quelque chose de nouveau vis-à-vis de la vieille notion juive du peuple de Dieu: cette ekklēsia, ce peuple de Dieu, est réformée en vue de la fin, grâce à l'action du Messie telle que Jésus la conçoit, c'est-à-dire aux souffrances du Serviteur de Dieu.¹⁶¹

Thus on the basis of the implicit Christology of the ministry, there rests an implicit ecclesiology. But why does Afanasev claim Cullmann presents this ecclesiology as being of the universal kind? The reference to the 'people of God' already makes the answer plain:

Dans la conscience judaïque le peuple de Dieu, surtout en tant que gehalla, se concevait comme un tout entier, englobant tous ses membres. Les différentes communautés de juifs étaient considérées comme les parties ou le prolongement dans l'espace de la communauté de Jérusalem, qui formait la gehalla idéale. En prenant pour base à la notion de l'Eglise l'idée juive du peuple de Dieu, M. Cullmann était obligé, conformément à sa conception

de l'Eglise, de donner ce même caractère à la communauté messianique que le Christ avait en vue de fonder. Bref, le Christ parlait dans Matthieu XVI.18 de l'Eglise universelle. Cette conclusion ne se trouve pas explicitement chez M. Cullmann, mais elle se sous-entend de façon naturelle.¹⁶²

Afanasev explains that he does not reject the doctrine of the Church as people of God; simply, he reserves the right to enquire whether that doctrine is the primitive conception, or, at any rate, the only primitive conception of the Church.

Afanasev's objections to Cullmann's 'translation' of ekklēsia as 'nouveau peuple de Dieu' are twofold. Firstly, for Scripture there are not two 'peoples of God' but one, in two different states in dependence on the two covenants. Secondly, as Cullmann's Christ et le Temps makes very clear the most original ecclesiological innovation of the New Testament is the suggestion that the people of God is now in the condition of being the body of Christ.¹⁶³ Why does Cullmann not use this notion to throw light on Jesus' intentions in the dialogue at Caesarea Philippi reported by Matthew? Probably because he did not think it possible to show that the language about the Church as 'body of Christ' was already formulated during the historic ministry. But here Afanasev interjects two points. Firstly, by accepting the radical novelty in Jesus' description of his messianic community, Cullmann has already abandoned that criterion of New Testament studies by which only concepts already familiar to Jewish thought in the period may be ascribed to Jesus or his interlocutors. Secondly, he denies that Paul is likely to have drawn his sōma tou Christou from a non-Christian source, more specifically from Stoicism. Apart from the

great divergences in the Pauline and Stoic concepts, if Paul had simply wished to speak of the organic unity of the Church there were many Old Testament images available for his purpose. Thus Afanasev concludes that Paul obtained his concept of the Church as Christ's body either from the Damascus road experience - the 'Why are you persecuting me?' of Acts, or from the paradosis of the Jerusalem church. Cullmann holds that behind the logia of John 2,19 and Mark 14,58 lies an authentic statement of Jesus which he recasts in the form, 'The temple will be destroyed'. But Afanasev takes issue with this 'reductionism':

Je ne vois aucun argument sérieux contre le fait que le Christ pouvait réellement parler de son Corps, comme d'un temple ou d'une arche où Dieu réside conjointement avec Son peuple.¹⁶⁴

From there it is not hard, Afanasev avers, to trace a line to the Pauline doctrine of the Church as body of Christ, a line passing through the experience of the Last Supper. Thus he concludes that in Matthew 16,18 Jesus spoke of a messianic community gathered in his body, as the Old Testament qahal had gathered in the Jerusalem temple.

La communauté du Christ diffère de la qehalla vétéro-testamentaire non pas parce qu'elle serait un nouveau peuple de Dieu ... mais parce que change le lieu de l'assemblée, ekklēsia, du peuple.¹⁶⁵

And Afanasev points out that the Qumran writings show that the men of the period could think of the community as a sanctuary.¹⁶⁶

But in this case, we are back with the eucharistic ecclesiology. And indeed Cullmann in his Les Sacrements de l'Evangile johannique had spoken of the Church as 'corps eucharistique du Christ'.¹⁶⁷ Though tendencies were already

manifesting themselves that would lead in time to a universal ecclesiology, and Afanasev cites especially here the claims of the Jerusalem community to be a 'mother-church', such tendencies could find no succour in Jesus' words to Peter. In the light of eucharistic ecclesiology, Peter has no dominically-given function in the universal Church for such a Church is far from the minds of the original community:

Matthieu XVI, 17-19 permet seulement de conclure que le Christ a fait de Pierre un chef à l'intérieur d'une église locale, mais il ne l'a pas placé à la tête des églises locales.¹⁶⁸

Afanasev laments Cullmann's retreat in his La Tradition from the position established in Christ et le Temps. In the earlier work, Cullmann had situated the birth of the Church at Easter, but in the successor study he postponed the 'time of the Church' to the period after the disappearance from the earthly scene of Christ's apostles. This radical disjunction between fondation (the Incarnation and apostolate) and édification, the later upbuilding of the Church, governs his entire approach to the concept of apostolic succession. Afanasev rejects this distinction on the grounds of its incompatibility with the Church's self-experience in the Eucharist.

Dans l'esprit de l'ecclesiologie eucharistique nous ne pouvons pas séparer la 'fondation' de l'Eglise de son 'édification', car ces deux moments forment un seul acte unique. L'Eglise apparaît dans la vie empirique d'un seul coup, comme une unité, dans toute sa plénitude. Elle n'aurait pas pu apparaître autrement, parce que l'Eglise-corpus du Christ ne peut exister que dans sa plénitude.¹⁶⁹

We can speak of the upbuilding of the local church, but not of that of the Church of God in Christ, which remains 'toujours

égale à elle-même'. With Pentecost the Church, founded at the Last Supper, was fully actualised, taking the immediate form (as it so happened) of the local church of Jerusalem. For Afanasev, Peter became the rock by becoming the first proestōs of this first Eucharistic assembly. He distances himself in the strongest terms from Cullmann's suggestion that Peter was rock as head of the Jewish-Christian mission everywhere. Cullmann's hypothesis here would extend to all the local churches the situation of division (Petrine Jewish-Christians against Pauline Gentile-Christians) that Paul combatted so energetically at Corinth.

Afanasev finds the apostolic succession to Peter through his exegesis of John 21,15-23. While the beloved disciple will 'remain', i.e. lack successors, Peter will be richly endowed with them - in the Eucharistic assembly.¹⁷⁰ On historical and exegetical grounds, with particular reference to First Peter, Afanasev considers that Peter was indeed proestōs of the local church of Rome. But did he, in that case, transmit more to the Roman bishops who occupied his seat of presidency than to bishops everywhere who also followed him in the same function?

Chaque évêque dans son église est le successeur de Pierre, mais celui de Rome en est son successeur d'une façon plus concrète. si l'on peut dire, que les autres évêques. C'est pourquoi la chaire de l'église de Rome se trouve être la chaire de Pierre d'une manière toute spéciale... La situation particulière de l'église de Rome d'était pas sans lui donner une autorité spéciale au sein de la famille de toutes les églises locales.¹⁷¹

Afanasev asserts that Church history is not the result of sheer contingency. The special situation of the Roman church is 'en

quelque sort une élection de Dieu'. But the necessary mark of this election is recognition, réception, by other churches. Perhaps the destruction of the Jerusalem church was providentially ordered to the Church's awareness that no church has priority by right. And so there follows the by now familiar Afanasevan theology of priority: a pre-eminence of witness in the freedom of grace, and not a canonical primacy founded on law.

In 'La doctrine de la primauté à la lumière de l'ecclésiologie', Afanasev brings together ex professo the aspects of his theology relevant to an evaluation of Roman claims. He rejects the predominant Orthodox approach to both magisterium and jurisdiction: conciliar infallibility is no more than a thesis of the Scholastic manuals, while the versions of ecclesial supremacy the East has sponsored - whether emperor, Pentarchy, or the kēdomonia pantōn of the Constantinople patriarch - have all collapsed in ruins. All are vitiated in any case by the presence within them of the Cyprianic universalism. Yet the theme of universalism is not itself alien to the Church: whereas catholicity is attributed to the local church, and indicates the Church's nature, universality refers to the limitless outreach whereby the union of love of local churches spreads across the earth.

Toutes les églises locales apparaissent comme unies en une large alliance d'Amour, qui tend vers une extension continue, en s'efforçant d'y inclure un nombre toujours plus grande d'églises nouvelles. Dans cette aspiration, elle ne connaît pas d'autres frontières que celles qui sont empiriquement les limites de l'univers.¹⁷²

Primacy must be manifested within this 'concorde' or 'concert' of love, and never against it.

La parole de l'église qui détient la primauté n'a pas de valeur en soi, mais elle en acquiert une quand elle devient révélation de la volonté de Dieu dans l'Eglise.¹⁷³

Like any other church, the church in primacy can err: this is why it needs the concert of the other churches to witness to the authenticity of its voice. The church in primacy errs with especial gravity whenever it attempts to enforce its will on the other churches, elevating itself above the union of love. Yet even in such circumstances, the primacy itself is not, through God's mercy, rendered forfeit.

Dans l'erreur et dans la méprise, l'église qui a la primauté conserve son élection tant que Dieu ne lui enlève pas le don de primauté dans le témoignage.¹⁷⁴

Historically, Afanasev finds the Roman primacy exercised as he would wish it in the Prima Clementis and in pope Victor's intervention in the Pascal problem, an intervention which followed on the gaining of consent from other churches. It is, he feels, appropriately set forth in Ignatius' inscription to his Letter to the Romans and in the great primacy text of Irenaeus' Adversus Haereses. The transformation of the agapeistic primacy into one of power is now laid at the door of pope Stephen I. Yet Stephen's crime lay chiefly in his susceptibility to the influence of Cyprian of Carthage who not only invited the Roman pope to depose Marcian of Arles but despatched to Rome his De unitate Ecclesiae with 'ce terme magique, cathedra Petri'.

Dans la conscience d'Etienne pouvait facilement se produire un glissement de la compréhension de l'Eglise de Rome dans le sens de la primauté du pouvoir. Malgré toutes les distinctions entre primauté d'autorité dans le domaine du témoignage et primauté de pouvoir, la première pouvait facilement passer dans l'autre dès que l'idée de l'Eglise universelle eût pris quelque force.¹⁷⁵

Thus the fateful concept of the plenitudo potestatis, linked to Matthew 16,18, slumbered at Rome until awoken by Leo the Great.¹⁷⁶

Afanasev's 'E'Eglise qui préside dans l'amour', despite its celebrity, is no more than a rehearsal of the conclusions to which he had in essence come as early as 'Dve idea vselenskoï Tserkvi' of 1934. The difference between 1934 and 1960 lies not in content but in atmosphere: the hope, born of the ecumenical exchanges of Catholic and Orthodox in post-war France, that the Roman church may once again sit in the president's chair in the union of love of a re-united Great Church. He begins from the question:

La primauté, que ce soit celle de Rome ou de toute autre église, peut-elle exister dans l'Eglise?¹⁷⁷

Taking up a distinction by now entirely familiar, he remarks that ecclesiological systems may be reduced to two: either universal ecclesiology or eucharistic ecclesiology. The Orthodox schools, following the example of Catholic ecclesiology, accept the first as axiomatic. According to this axiom, then:

l'Eglise est un organisme unique, dans lequel est incluse chaque unité ecclésiale, quelle qu'elle soit, et, tout d'abord, celle à la tête de laquelle se trouve l'évêque.¹⁷⁸

The basic principles of this theory were formulated by Cyprian.

For Cyprian:

la division de l'Eglise catholique en églises locales est le résultat de la diffusion, dans la vie empirique, d'un épiscopat unique sous forme de la multiplicité de évêques.¹⁷⁹

The concors numerositas of the bishops is preserved in effect by summarily banishing from their number any one no longer in accord with the rest, and therefore no longer qualified to share in the episcopate. Towards the end of his life Cyprian realised that such a body cannot work without a head and so, half-

willingly, half-unwillingly, he raised the Roman bishop to this pre-eminence, regarding him as Peter's heir directly, the rest only indirectly.

Cyprian's system is logical but wrong. The Church of the first two centuries knew nothing of such an ecclesiology which is over-influenced by the Roman imperial ideal of unity in toto orbe terrarum. We should never have found the idea of the Church universal in the New Testament, and least of all in Paul, Afanasev avers, were it not already present in our minds as a result of the currency the Cyprianic schema attained. For Paul by contrast:

Chaque église locale est l'Eglise de Dieu en Christ car le Christ demeure en son corps dans l'assemblée eucharistique, et c'est grâce à la communion au corps du Christ que les fidèles deviennent membres de son corps. L'indivisibilité du corps du Christ conditionne la plénitude de l'Eglise qui demeure dans chaque église locale.¹⁸⁰

In ecclesiology, 'un plus un fait toujours un'.¹⁸¹ What in such a context of thought, such a eucharistic ecclesiology, could primacy be? The multitude of churches form a union founded on concord and love. In practice this means that every local church is open to accepting and making its own the events that shape the life of other churches. Such a reception is the witness of a local church indwelt by the Church of God to the work being done in other churches similarly so indwelt. But the witness of a local church in this way may vary in weight: a local church will have a greater authority in witnessing if it has a greater realisation

of the presence of the Church of God within itself. Equal in value, they are not necessarily equal in authority. And this latter inequality creates a hierarchy or order among local churches. If there is hierarchy, however, then there must be a church to head the hierarchy. The act of reception of such a church would have quite decisive importance.

Such a 'church-in-priority' as Afanasev calls it will not possess a primacy of honour over another church; nor will it seek to impose its will on another. The authority of love is not of this kind.

Lorsqu'une église locale s'adresse à celle qui a la primauté, elle ne s'adresse pas à un tribunal qui doit prononcer une décision sans appel: elle s'adresse à l'église qui a la priorité pour s'y trouver elle-même, c'est-à-dire pour entendre la voix de l'Eglise qui y demeure.¹⁸²

Historically, a church-in-priority may come to its dignity through a number of empirical factors: foundation by an apostle, in a great metropolis, with very many adherents. Yet other local churches can also claim such a background in more than one case.

En définitive, il faut admettre que la priorité est un don de Dieu, et donc une élection de Dieu, qui ne peut pas être entièrement comprise par nous, mais qui est acceptée, dans la liberté et l'amour, par toute la multitude des églises locales qui suivent l'église qui a la priorité.¹⁸³

The priority of a church is reflected in the person of its bishop, but the bishop's role is dependent on that of his church as a whole. Eucharistic ecclesiology cannot admit

even theoretically that the individual bishop possessing primacy could be found outside a definite church, a church-in-priority. Ignatius of Antioch pictures the local churches gathered in a eucharistic assembly, as it were, with the Roman church in the chair, presiding in the agapē. To this church all others 'must appeal' according to Irenaeus: but this imperative is more than juridical, for the witness of the church-in-priority is more, not less, weighty than a legal verdict. The authority of the Roman church was not conceived in legal-political terms until a universal ecclesiology arrived on the scene in the church at large. Afanasev concludes by applying his theory to the present state of Catholic/Orthodox relations. The simple fact that the Orthodox churches do not recognise the Roman primacy in its present form, '(le) fait même de cette non-reconnaissance', justifies their non-recognition. There can be no church-in-priority in practice without consent by churches-not-in-priority. 'You have no authority' said by local churches to one particular local church is a performative utterance, removing the right of the latter to claim authority. But the reaction of Orthodoxy to take refuge in 'autocephalous churches' is no more justified than the style of Roman primacy which provoked it. Such structures are monstrous, 'half-political half-ecclesial'. The Orthodox are right to say that all churches possess catholicity, but

la priorité de l'autorité en tant que témoignage de ce qui se passe dans l'Eglise n'appartient qu'à celle 'qui préside dans l'Amour'.¹⁸⁴

Chapter IV The use of the Fathers in Afanasev

The heart of Afanasev's appeal to the Fathers lies in his evocation of the life of the ancient Church as (in the words of the late Byzantine Nicholas Cabasilas) 'life in Christ', a life finding its source and goal in the Liturgy but expressing itself in charity at all levels. It is clear from the tone and manner of Afanasev's writing that he does not regard this appeal to the patristic age as simply a matter of an empirical comparison, more or less illuminating, between two periods of Church history. The appeal to the Fathers is made by way of being an appeal to authority, even though Afanasev by some other criterion also finds himself able to criticise the teaching of individual Fathers.

In what follows, his principal patristic sources will be considered in what is generally regarded as their correct chronological order, although in one case, the Didache, Afanasev, following the judgment of the Cambridge scholar F. E. Vokes¹, would have disagreed.

a. The Didache

The Didache is certainly not one of Afanasev's favourite works. In the early chapters of TsDSV it is commended for its author's awareness that a local church may sometimes lack a ministry of prophets.² This awareness seems to confirm Afanasev's own insistence that a church to be a church may lack many divine gifts but can never lack its proestōs, its Eucharistic president. But a fuller ex professo discussion in Chapter IV of TsDSV produces a much more negative estimate. The Didache's stress on the prophesying of the genuine prophet as always in-and-of-itself true

prophecy cuts off the prophetic individual from the Eucharistic community - unlike the Pauline account which sees prophecy as a gift to the whole local church via the individual. The assertion that the prophet can absolve from sin displaces the bishop. The ascription of the right to 'give thanks', i.e. preside at agapē or Eucharist, to the prophet also gives to him what is rightfully the bishop's, namely the role of proestōs.³ Above all, the Didache's ministerial prophets do not belong to a local church but wander from one such to another. In them the Didache testifies to its own adherence to a universalist account of the Church, an account made explicit elsewhere in its pages. It is, in fact, according to Afanasev, our earliest example of such an ecclesiology.⁴ Following F. E. Vokes, Afanasev finds the explanation for this deviation from the 'norm' by situating the Didache in a milieu outside the Great Church. In Vokes' words, it

gives in the form of a summary of apostolic teaching a description of what can be called the 'apostolic element' of Montanism; ... its purpose is the defence of the 'New Prophecy'.⁵

The Didache is one of the most controversial of early Christian documents, and it is not surprising if Afanasev manifests a certain ambivalence in its regard. It appeared at a time when scholarship had come to something of an impasse in the study of Christian origins, and as the only major discovery of the period (the 1880's) in early Christian literature it was made to support everyone's favoured theories. As C. Bigg wrote, it was the 'spoilt child of criticism'.⁶ Vokes defined the 'real problem' of the Didache as being

whether it is a picture of the Church at the time when it was written, an antiquarian picture of the Church as it was at some time in the past, or an imaginary picture.⁷

He came down with some force, in company with other scholars of the time, on a combination of the second and third of these three possibilities. The author of the Didache tries to express in New Testament and 'apostolic' language what is common to his church and that of the New Testament itself. His church supported a 'moderate Montanism' which it expressed in 'as respectable and apostolic a form as possible'. This explains the mixture of primitiveness and development to be found in the document. Vokes' hypothesis is far from being merely impressionistic. He argues from a close analysis of the relations between the Gospels, the Letter of Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache that the Didache was written after Hermas, and thus no earlier than c.150. In general - and surely correctly - Vokes held that the proper procedure for dealing with the Didache was to fit it into the known framework of early Christian history, as its finder and other early students tried to do. However, because it was the 'spoilt child' this was not done. Instead, its early date was exaggerated and its significance for a revision of the accepted picture blown up out of all proportion by those whose purpose was to demolish traditional Christianity by postulating a primitive Eucharist like that apparently described in Didache ix and x, and a primitive 'charismatic' ministry like that inferred from Didache xi and xii. Theologically liberal Church historians thought they saw in the 'Two Ways' section of the Didache a superficially Christianised Jewish pamphlet, and in chapters ix, x and xiv a primitive, pre-Catholic Eucharist still closely connected with the Kiddush, while in chapters xi-xv at large they found an absence of ministerial organisation which they ascribed to the preponderant position of spiritually gifted 'prophets'. In the entire text they divined a preoccupation with ethics and a lack of interest in dogma,

two characteristics which to scholars of the school of Adolf von Harnack and Paul Sabatier were signs of primitive Christianity.⁸

In terms of later scholarship, the principal defect in Vokes' presentation lies in his denial that the Didache has any characteristic Jewish-Christian qualities. He explicitly says that

the Didache shows, like any Christian writing of any period, the Jewish origin of Christianity, but it shows no special knowledge of Rabbinic writings or Jewish customs. Its knowledge of Judaism is in no way greater than that of any other Christian writer. So far as its knowledge of Judaism and its partaking in the Jewish legacy to Christianity is concerned, the Didache is quite timeless.⁹

That the author of the Didache is innocent of detailed knowledge of Rabbinic thought and practice may be conceded. Nevertheless, Vokes' wider conclusion from this no longer carried the same conviction. In the present state of scholarship, where the portrait of Jewish-Christianity is now much better filled out, the Didache seems to belong firmly within this particular 'world', one of several, as Jean Daniélou pointed out, that together constitute the patristic Church.¹⁰

As early as an essay of C. H. Dodd in 1947, important reserves were announced about the late date ascribed to the Didache on the Connolly-Vokes hypothesis.¹¹ But in 1958 the most substantial study of the Didache yet to appear emerged from the French Canadian Dominican Jean-Paul Audet.¹² Partly by demonstrating that the 'longer title' of the Didache, 'Instruction of the Lord to the Gentiles via the Twelve Apostles', was inauthentic, Audet replaced the work firmly into the Jewish-Christian milieu to which form every indication it belongs.¹³ He reversed the arguments of the earlier scholars on the dependence of the Didache on Barnabas, The Shepherd and the canonical Gospels,¹⁴ proposing that .

the date of the work is around the year 60 and its place of origin Syria or Palestine, probably Antioch.¹⁵ Naturally, it is not possible to enter here into the details of this controversy, but it may be said that Audet's thesis has won wide support and this of itself necessarily sets a major question mark against Afanasev's use of the Didache. If the text is as early as the earliest gospel, then in terms of empirical antiquity the universalist ecclesiology must be allowed to be as ancient as its 'eucharistic' counterpart.

Nevertheless, Afanasev's portrait of the Didache and its place (or non-place) in the tradition may be saved if it is expressed in a more nuanced form. Granted that the Didache may well be of the highest antiquity, it may still represent a sub-tradition rather than the mainstream. If it could be shown that Montanism is itself of Jewish-Christian inspiration, then the itinerant Jewish-Christian prophets of the Didache, belonging to no one local church but only to the Church at large, rather as the mediaeval friars were 'exempt' from the jurisdiction of local bishops, may be seen as quite marginal in any attempt to re-draw the outline of the ancient Church in its central manifestations.¹⁶ Yet the links between Montanism and Jewish Christianity remain stubbornly unclear. And in any case, to argue that the particularities of Jewish Christian churches can make no contribution to a normative ecclesiology is to accept the disputable thesis that theological history must belong to the victors.

b. Ignatius of Antioch

Ignatius of Antioch is without doubt the hero of Afanasev's oeuvre.¹⁷ Although his vocabulary is often imprecise and even exotic, he was nevertheless the first figure in the history of doctrine to speak about the constitution of the Christian ecclesia, the pre-eminence of the bishop in each local church and the priority of the church, though not

bishop, of Rome. A number of aspects of Ignatian ecclesiology are dear to Afanasev. Firstly, there is the principle of the co-inherence of bishop and church.¹⁸ Secondly, there is the stress on the indissoluble union of president and people, forming together 'one choir'.¹⁹ Thirdly, there is the dependence of Ignatius' portrait of the Church on the eucharistic assembly, and behind that, the Last Supper.²⁰ Fourthly, although the Ignatian letters probably permit presbyters to preside at the Eucharist²¹, their fundamental tendency is to press further the transformation of the 'proto-presbyter' of apostolic times into the monarchical bishop of the patristic period.²²

In one sense, however, the arrival of the monepiscopate in Ignatian Syria was an ambiguous development in Afanasev's eyes. The emergence of the classical episcopate also involved the emergence of a 'high priestly' symbolism in which the bishop was taken to be the efficacious sign in the Church of the high priesthood of Christ as presented in the Letter to the Hebrews. The bishop occupies, after all, the place of Christ the high priest at the Last Supper when he presides at the Eucharist which to Afanasev's mind is the fulness of the Church of God. It is this high priestly symbolism which is of questionable value, as Afanasev sees it. Insofar as it expressed the high significance for the local church of its eucharistic 'president in the Lord', well and good; insofar as it created the possibility of regarding the bishop's eucharistic presidency as flowing from his 'priesthood' and not vice versa, it was a snare.²³ The price later paid, in separating the Eucharist from the ministry by postulating a (non-Eucharistic) pontificate of the apostles, was extortionate... The willingness to pay it can only be explained by fear of fragmentation within Church communities. The centrifugal

force of early heresies moved the Church to exalt the bishop, as guardian of the faith proclaimed at the Eucharist, to the highest level of authority it could find.²⁴

But whatever germs of later exaggeration there may be in Ignatius' presentation of the figure of the bishop, all are pardonable to Afanasev because of Ignatius' resolutely particularist doctrine of the Church and this is the final, and most significant reason for his commendation of him. For Ignatius, each local church manifests the one Church of God in Christ. The Church of God is not the sum-total of local churches but is fully given in each. Nevertheless, at the empirical level, the local churches do of course form a union, based in Ignatius on charity, and therefore in a derivative way this union of churches may also be spoken of - but very secondarily - as the 'one Church'. It is on this last point that an evaluation of Afanasev's use of Ignatius must largely turn. That Ignatius' chief interest is the life of the various local churches to which he wrote can hardly be in doubt. Afanasev's belief that he was inspired by the Matthaean logion on the presence of Jesus in the assembly of two or three in his name may be well-founded, given the likely influence on him of the Matthaean tradition, whether in oral or written form.²⁵ Ignatius' main message is the need for solidarity with the proestōs of each such gathering. The bishop is the president of the Church's assembly in each city, the leader of its 'choir', the head of the body, even though he may be assisted by other ministers, by presbyters and deacons. Around the bishop all must gather, uniting themselves to him in full obedience, doing nothing without him. To be with the bishop is to have a part in the Church, and so in Jesus Christ, and so in God. Whereas not to be with him, as the dissidents and false doctors are not with him, is

to lack all these realities.²⁶

Nevertheless, it may be questioned whether Ignatius' ecclesiology is as wholly non-universalist as Afanasev believes. In the Letter to the Smyrnaeans, for instance, Ignatius speaks of Christ as, through his Resurrection, 'setting up an ensign', arē susemon, for all ages, for Jews and Gentiles alike, 'in the one body of his Church', en heni sōmati tēs ekklēσίας autou.²⁷ Later in the same letter Ignatius appears to be working with an analogy which cuts across the Afanasevan model of the Church: what the bishop is to the local church, Christ is to the Church universal:

hopou an phanē ho episkopos, ekei to
plēthos ētō, hōsper hopou an ē Iēsous
Christos, ekei hē katholikē ekklēsia.²⁸

Most strikingly of all, in the Letter to the Magnesians, Christ is referred to by the title 'the bishop of all', pantōn episkopos.²⁹

The ontological link between the many churches and the one church is not simply found in the 'intensive' catholicity of each's manifestation of the single mystery. Their inter-relationship also possesses an 'extensive' dimension. It is possible that Afanasev misunderstood the term agapē, 'charity', at a vital point in the Ignatian corpus. The point concerns the ascription of 'priority' (to use Afanasev's language) to the Roman church in the opening greeting of Ignatius' Letter to the Romans. The 'presidency in charity' of the Roman church in this passage is best translated as presidency in the Church. Agapē here is not a purely moral quality, the works of mercy and loving-kindness which some commentators have suggested.³⁰ As was pointed out as long ago as 1881,

wherever the verb prokathēnai, 'to preside', is used with a direct complement it is followed by a name indicating a place or a society.³¹

Agapē here is in fact equivalent to ekklēsia. Ignatius has already used it to denote local churches.³² Why should he not use it for the Church

universal? Hence the Latin translation offered by F. X. Funk: universo caritatis coetui praesidens.³³ Though Afanasev was aware of the ecclesial force of Ignatius' agapē he proposed to protect the 'particularist' hypothesis by construing the phrase prokathēmenē en tēs agapēs on the basis of the inscription of the Letter. There the Roman church is said to 'have the presidency in the country of the Romans': prokathētai en topō chōriou Rōmaion.³⁴ At the time of writing TsDSv, Afanasev believed that Rome's 'priority' was exercised not in the universal agapē of Christendom at large but within the 'suburbicarian' local churches of central Italy, the foundation of the later Roman patriarchate. By the post-war years, however, he found in this text a twofold 'priority', both regional and worldwide, though he still insisted on interpreting the latter within the characteristic terms of eucharistic ecclesiology. But it is not certain that the mystery of co-inherence between the one Church and the many churches is exhausted for Ignatius by the local epiphany of the One in each of the Many. There may also be a sense in which the one Church is present in the many precisely as many. It is this further dimension, alluded to in the pregnant phrase 'the Charity' which Afanasev studiously ignores.

Nevertheless, he has captured the heart of Ignatian ecclesiology, which lies in the intensive presence of Christ's Church in the local community gathered around its bishop at the Eucharist. To that ecclesiology Afanasev himself whole-heartedly responded. One might think here, with von Campenhausen, of Ignatius' sense of the contemporary Church as a living mystery, united in its totality to Christ.³⁵ (Ignatius is little interested in the possible historical derivation of the Church's particular structures from the apostolic group.) Or again, one cannot fail to

note Ignatius' concept of unity as a union in sympathy, a harmony or fundamental agreement, something for which he prefers to use musical images.³⁶ One could reflect on how little Ignatius is concerned with legal norms, focussing instead on the holy fellowship embodied in the conjunction of bishop, clergy and congregation.³⁷ Finally, one might consider what has justly been termed the 'cultic' character of Ignatius' ideal of Church office.

Ignatius' total conception of the Church and of Christianity possesses a cultic character in this respect, namely that salvation becomes a reality only in unison with the activity of the visible congregation, performed both in the spirit and in the flesh; in this way the Church exhibits the divine world, and actualises it through its own way of life.³⁸

One could hardly ask for a better summary of Afanasev's own teaching in propria persona. At root, this similarity derives from the shared ecclesiological conviction that the Church is a mystery of differentiated ministerial charity: it is in this sense that Afanasev's fundamental doctrine of the Church is itself Ignatian.

c. Irenaeus

Irenaeus is of considerable interest to Afanasev, chiefly as author of the celebrated 'primacy text' of the Adversus Haereses:

Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentio-
rem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire
ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles,
in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata
est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio.³⁹

The context of this remarkable sentence is the context of the whole of Irenaeus' writing: the defence of the orthodox faith against heretical Gnosis. As is well-known, not least from his writings, a

large part of the debate of the orthodox with the Gnostics turned on formal arguments of authority, appeals to public revelation on the side of the former, to esoteric revelation on the side of the latter. Since the discovery of an entire Egyptian Gnostic library at Nag Hammadi in 1946, it has been possible to control in some way Irenaeus' description of his adversaries and the struggle with them.⁴⁰ The study of these forty-eight treatises very largely confirms the conclusions reached immediately after the Second World War by Père Sagnard.⁴¹ Irenaeus' account is as reliable and fair as we might expect from the hints he gives of how careful he has been to get acquainted with his opponents' arguments.⁴² Substantively, Irenaeus' opposition was directed to Gnostic dualism, to the notion that there are two worlds, one of which has its temporary outposts, eventually to be re-admitted, in another which is otherwise alien to it. Against this, Irenaeus proposes that there is a single world, a world full of God's glory, and one God who contains it all and governs its history by his providence. He substitutes for the Gnostic 'redemption-physics' a Christian 'redemption-history'. The Gnostics had seen their salvation, that is, as being by nature and from history; Irenaeus sees salvation, rather, as being by history, in nature. Irenaeus' starting-point, therefore, is what God has done for his people; centrally and most constitutively, what he has done in Christ.⁴³

It follows from this that formally an accurate understanding of what Christ has done historically, and so publicly, is vital. Thus the topic of the sources of revelation, fontes revelationis, emerges for the first time as an explicit object of theological reflection.⁴⁴ Irenaeus turns first to the Scriptures, but the Gnostics disputed the orthodox interpretation of the Scriptures in the light of their own occult

tradition. They took them in the light of their particular mythopoeic cosmology, rather than the other way round. Thus it was that Irenaeus found himself obliged to appeal to

traditionem quae est ab Apostolis, quae per
successiones Presbyterorum in Ecclesiis
custoditur.⁴⁵

If he wished, he could, he says, provide a list of all those who have presided over the churches from the time of the apostles onwards. But in fact he confines himself to giving the succession of these accredited witnesses to the apostolic tradition as found in one local church, the church of Rome, which here must stand for them all. When Christians disagree about the true gnōsis, the content of Christian revelation, then their practice is to have recourse to those communities that are the most ancient among all the churches. The witness of the churches where the apostles themselves taught stands for the witness of all.

nonne oporteret antiquissimas recurrere
ecclesias, in quibus Apostoli conversati
sunt, et ab eis de praesenti quaestione
sumere quod certum et re liquidum est?⁴⁶

Here we have the clue to Irenaeus' appeal to the faith of the Roman church since in her these criteria of venerableness and apostolicity are especially well evidenced. This church is

maximae et antiquissimae et omnibus cognitae, a
gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo
Romae fundatae et constitutae ecclesiae ...⁴⁷

We are now in a position to approach more closely the celebrated primacy text of the Adversus Haereses cited above.

Afanasev's discussion of this ecclesiologically momentous text turns on the nature of the obligation involved in the 'recourse' to the church founded on the martyria of Peter and Paul. What is the ground and nature of this necesse, this 'must', which, according

to Irenaeus' Latin translator, obliges a church to recurrere, 'have recourse to', or convenire, 'turn to', the Roman church for guidance? Afanasev suggests that necesse in Irenaeus does not at all imply some kind of legal obligation. Instead, it is more like what may be called an ontological exigence. It springs from the very nature of the Church. Where there is disagreement there will naturally (in effect, supernaturally) be recourse to the church with the greatest authority. This church will bear her witness on events in other churches, not sustaining this witness by force of law, but by force of love. And so Afanasev can remark:

If there has ever been a time in church history when the catchword Roma locuta est, causa finita stood for something real, that time was before the church of Rome had any powers by law. ⁴⁸

What, then, is this 'greater authority', potentior principalitas, with which Irenaeus credits the Roman church? Afanasev admits that in the absence of the Greek original, the text is hard to interpret. The exhaustive analysis of the phrase in Père Sagnard's edition of this book of the Adversus Haereses amply confirms this judgement. ⁴⁹ But he proposes that what is at stake here is not power, thus not a canonical ('political') primacy of legislation and administration but rather authority, and more especially, the authority which flows from apostolic foundation and constitution by Peter and Paul. To mark this distinction between power and authority, Afanasev decrees that to be faithful to Irenaeus' meaning we should speak here not of primacy but of priority. The Roman church is the church with the 'greatest priority'. ⁵⁰

In fact, this is to some degree a matter of verbal stipulation on Afanasev's part. 'Primacy' does not seem to connote 'power' more than 'authority' in the four Western languages in which Afanasev's essay appeared, any more than 'priority' necessarily connotes

'authority' more than 'power'. More significant is Afanasev's conjecture about the Greek term underlying the crucial words potentior principalitas. The word archaiotēs which he holds to be original conveys the idea of being connected to a source, to some ultimate foundation, archē - just as, originally, the word auctoritas did in Latin. Because of its source or foundation in the apostles Peter and Paul, the witness of the Roman church among the churches takes on a unique and exemplary character. Her authority is simply the authority of this unique and exemplary character of witness, as that witness is applied to any matter of doctrine or life in another church which may come to her attention. Her 'powers' are powers to receive or to not-receive the actions, credal or practical, of another church. But because she is the church in priority, then her non-reception of the choices of a local church are not merely a breakdown in good relations between the churches. They are not simply an empirical disorder, an eruption on the surface of the body politic of the Church. Rather, they are a placing of that other local church under the judgement of the Lord of the Church, who is, for Afanasev as for Irenaeus, the true Fount of the apostolic witness.

d. Tertullian and Montanism

A phrase from Tertullian's Montanist period gives Afanasev the title of Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo.⁵¹ Afanasev's references to Tertullian are sympathetic and very far from a tendency in some modern Orthodox writing to make him the father of an alleged all-pervasive legalism in the Latin Church (a case made out in some Western writers also, notably the late Walter Ullmann).⁵² But it may well be that Tertullian was not, in fact, a jurisconsultus; it is prima facie unlikely that a Christian would have been under the Antonines, and the legal knowledge

shown in Tertullian's writings would be explicable on the thesis that he had simply received a normal good education of the period.⁵³ In any case what attracts Afanasev is not, oddly enough, the Catholic Tertullian but Tertullian the Montanist. Afanasev wishes to 'save' Tertullian for the Church by arguing that his account of the Church's nature applies, despite appearances, to the Catholic Church itself. The Church is at the deepest level what Tertullian believed it had ceased to be, namely, the 'Church of the Holy Spirit', a body essentially charismatic, and withdrawn from the 'structural patterns' (above all power-relationships) of 'this age'.⁵⁴

The sharp division between Church and world in Afanasev, the stress laid on the Church as an eschatological reality placed, against nature, here and now in the space and time of a fallen aiōn, is markedly reminiscent of the North African tradition to which Tertullian belonged.⁵⁵ Contemporary historians suggest that Christianity arrived in Africa in the Antonine age, via the Jewish community of Carthage. Be this as it may, the Christian Church in Africa Proconsularis soon took on its keynote of uncompromising rejection of an alien world, a note already audible in the Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs, while reception of the Passio Felicitatis et Perpetuae at Carthage (where in Augustine's day it was read in church and treated by some as on the same level as the canonical Scriptures) indicates that the African church, precisely because of its thoroughgoing eschatological posture, would in all probability be open to Montanist influence.⁵⁶ The Passio's message is that acceptance of prophecies and visions gives the Christian the courage to face martyrdom - exactly the claim made by Tertullian for the New Prophecy in his De Fuga.⁵⁷

Montanus began to prophesy in the Roman province of Asia around

the year 170.⁵⁸ The New Prophecy spread rapidly and to judge from one source nearly achieved the recognition of the Catholic episcopate.⁵⁹ But as the Carthaginian church (which was coming to enjoy a quasi-patriarchal authority in North Africa) moved steadily away from Montanism, Tertullian moved towards it. Tertullian's interest in Montanism seems to have sprung from a sense that the Church had suffered an over-heavy institutionalisation (though such language is, of course, hardly of the second century).

Ecclesia Spiritus per spiritalem hominem,
non ecclesia numerus episcoporum.⁶⁰

In addition, however, we must allow a place to the intellectual dialectic Tertullian faced during the writing of his anti-Gnostic and anti-Marcionite works. It was during the composition of these books that he came to accept the New Prophecy.⁶¹ Over against the systems of thought just mentioned, he insisted that Christianity was a revealed religion (not a religion excogitated out of inner experience), and that it was a religion based on (though not restricted to) the Scriptures (and that meant, vis-à-vis Marcion, the entire biblical corpus). But had this revelation ceased, or did the Spirit still speak to men? This concern with the charismatic contemporaneity of the Spirit to the Church was matched in Tertullian's case with a dislike of practical innovations in Church discipline, innovations that could be held to blur the radicalism of life in the Spirit as that had been (arguably) practised in the apostolic age.⁶² Essentially, this was the problem of the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin. It was these two features in combination (how is revelation actual now; must not the pristine integrity of Christian practice be maintained) which led Tertullian to the New Prophecy. The crucial test of obedience

to the Paraclete's inspiration and demands lay in the willingness to follow where this movement led. The Paraclete gives direct counsel to every Christian; his promptings preserve doctrinal orthodoxy and they enable men to live lives fitting to those who may well have to die martyrs' deaths.⁶³

It follows that, insofar as Afanasev is concerned to redeem the Montanist Tertullian, and insofar as, in dependence on Tertullian, he regards his own view of the Church as 'charismatic', this has little if anything to do with the 'neo-Pentecostal' spirituality which began to touch all mainstream Christian churches (including the Orthodox of North America) in the decade which saw Afanasev's death. As Jean Steinmann pointed out, Tertullian was not attracted by the more exotic aspects of the Phrygian 'charismatic renewal'.⁶⁴ His devotion to the New Prophecy lay in the fact that it seemed to bear out his own prior teaching on the Paraclete, as, for instance, he had expressed that in the Ad Martyres which can be described as an essay in practical pneumatology.⁶⁵

Less credible in historical context is Steinmann's suggestion that in separating himself from the Church Tertullian 'se désolidarise d'avance de Constantin'. Steinmann proposed that by their disassociation from the New Prophecy

la hiérarchie préparait l'union de la nouvelle religion avec les vieilles structures de la civilisation impériale.....⁶⁶

The idea might well have been congenial to Afanasev, as we shall see from a consideration later in this Chapter of his attitude to Augustine. But the fact is that even after Constantine (and, more to the point, even after Theodosius), the great majority of the African Church

remained hostile to or suspicious of the imperial connexion. Even such an anti-Donatist as Augustine came, in the De Civitate Dei, to share many of their doubts.⁶⁷ What Afanasev takes from Tertullian's Montanism is, then, firstly, a stress on the Spirit as the continuing and thus contemporary source of the life of the Church in all its native manifestations ('ministries') and secondly, the notion that because the Spirit is the Spirit of the Parousia (his presence now is proleptic, a 'first-fruits' of the Resurrection whose full virtue will only be gauged by the 'events' of the end of time), the Church of her nature is incompatible with the pattern, laws and values of the age where she is set. What Afanasev does not take is Tertullian's counter-posing of homo spiritalis^u and numerus episcoporum, something further expressed in the Tertullianic assertion that the distinction between plebs, the faithful (and catechumens), and ordo, the ordained ministry, is simply an ecclesiastical device, something of purely human origin. Afanasev's aim is to re-situate the Church's ministries, ministries regarded by him as an internal differentiation of the Church's nature qua 'royal priesthood', within a pneumatic ecclesiology indebted to the later Tertullian.

Afanasev has rightly seen that for Tertullian, the person of the Holy Spirit is particularly engaged in the sphere of the Church: the Church is born at Pentecost, the parousia of the Spirit.⁶⁸ Afanasev does not mention, however, the important motif of the Church as mother in Tertullian, ecclesia mater, which may well have underground pneumatological connexions. Writers at various points in the tradition, ranging from the Syriac fathers in the patristic East to Gerard Manley Hopkins in the nineteenth century West, have associated the Spirit with 'feminine' aspects of the divine economy in creation and redemption.⁶⁹

According to one major contemporary study, the theme of the Church as mother is a controlling image in Tertullian's presentation of the mystery of the Church, and an essence-revealing image at that. Pointing out that for ancient thought the image is not simply an illustration of some reality but is 'la réalité même dans sa visualisation immédiate en tant qu'expression et représentation', Karl Delehayé regards the primary images of the Fathers, following in the wake of the biblical authors, as an 'historicised' version of such an ontology of images.⁷⁰ Tertullian's symbol of mater ecclesia should, therefore, be given a fully ontological weight in pondering his ecclesiology. However, the implications of the symbol once rendered in conceptual theological discourse might well carry one towards the more unitary and so universalist ecclesiology which Afanasev deplores.

e. Origen

Origen plays a curiously dislocated role in Afanasev's work. In the first place, his writings are called into evidence for the principle of the 'concelebration' of sacramental acts by proestōs and people,⁷¹ and for the development of the proestōs into a pastor.⁷² Secondly, however, he is held to have originated two notions which cut across the fundamental Afanasevan view of the Church as a Spirit-given eucharistic assembly. These notions are the idea that an unworthy bishop cannot celebrate the Eucharist for the people⁷³ and the concept of 'spiritual communion'.⁷⁴ The first of these, at any rate, may be linked to another feature of Origen's teaching pointed out by Afanasev, the attack on bishops for their prepotenza.⁷⁵ But thirdly, and without further explanation, Afanasev claims that Origen 'forcefully advanced' the universalist ecclesiology already found in the Didache.⁷⁶

As elsewhere, the most controversial statement here is the last. By way of contrast, we can refer to the comments of Gustave Bardy, whose own grasp of patristic ecclesiology was encyclopaedic. For him, in sharp contra-distinction to Afanasev, 'le docteur alexandrin parle plus volontiers des Eglises que de l'Eglise'. Bardy continues by speaking of Origen in these terms:

Il est sensible à ce fait que, de son temps, le christianisme prend la forme extérieure d'une fédération.⁷⁷

But if true, this judgement must entail that Origen has a significant doctrine of the local church to which a universalist doctrine of the Church has been appended. It may well be, therefore, that here, as with Cyprian, the presence of a universalism complementing or deepening a eucharistic particularism has sufficed to make Afanasev see only the former. And most certainly the former does exist in Origen. He speaks of the churches throughout the world as constituting the 'single body' of the Church;⁷⁸ of the Church as the 'single house' outside of which the paschal Lamb should not be eaten;⁷⁹ as the ark of Noah which alone saves from the Flood;⁸⁰ and as the Bride of Christ.⁸¹

What then are the main features of this portrait of the one and manifold church? Origen takes for granted a laos served by a three-fold ministry but his special interest lies in his depiction of a group who cut across this distinction, that of the didaskaloi. Among these 'teachers' of the Church his own place, Afanasev remarks, is by no means the least.⁸² Such teachers might well be bishops, but then again they might equally well be presbyters or deacons or laymen. Afanasev is perfectly right in singling out this element in Origen as revelatory of his deepest concerns. Origen's interest in the didaskaloi

probably derives from two sources. First, there is his concern with doctrinal clarity as well as truth, something amply attested by the Peri Archōn which has been called the first essay in systematic theology in the Church's history. Secondly, his attentiveness to the contribution of 'teachers' reflects his concern with Christian gnōsis, that is, with the contemplative appropriation of the Gospel as a wisdom. It is this latter which gives Origen a certain tendency to relativise the importance of the sacramental life. For him, the sacramental signs of the Liturgy are chiefly of interest as images of and means to the reception of the Logos by human minds. It will readily be seen that such a tendency fits ill with Afanasev's own sacramental realism and his insistence on the transcendent (and therefore intellectually always mysterious) presence of the Holy Spirit in his ecclesial gifts.

If the notion of 'spiritual communion' can be explained in terms of Origen's Logos-centred intellectual mysticism, his Donatist-sounding language about the unworthy bishop depends on another but related aspect of his thought. Hans von Campenhausen has brought out the curious combination ⁱⁿ of Origen of, on the one hand, a thorough acceptance of the received pattern of the Church's life with, on the other, a certain insouciance in treating that received pattern. There is a sense in which, for Origen, the Church is primarily a 'living, free cosmos of spiritual gifts in which every Christian can share without the help of official mediators':⁸³ but at the same time:

the normal and desirable thing in his view is that the one who is endowed with spiritual gifts should also be appointed to the corresponding position in the Church, so that he may be able to work for the benefit of the whole.⁸⁴

One illustration of this is that while all bishops in Origen's eyes should have the gifts of didaskaloi, if they do not then God will not leave his people uninstructed. The didaskaloi are not for him a parallel

authority in the Church to the 'pastoral magisterium' of the bishops.⁸⁵ What is original and constitutive in Origen's account is not the place given to the didaskaloi as such but the adoption of the ideal of Christian gnostic perfection norm for all those engaged in ministerial activity. The problem was that this ascetical-intellectual ideal eluded the Church's ministers as a body in Origen's time, as no doubt it would in any historical period. Origen's solution to a problem largely of his own making was to argue that where a bishop does not fulfil his spiritual duties he stands spiritually among the laity whom he ought to lead.⁸⁶ Conversely, frequently enough the layman is a bishop in the eyes of God, even though he has never been made such by consecration.⁸⁷ Curiously, this does not lead to a rejection of the traditional pattern of the ministry in Origen because he is clear that such situations are contradictions of the proper spiritual norm, to be corrected by better discernment of gifts in the selection of the Church's servants. Origen's reasons for thus holding fast to the apostolic ordering of the community are well expressed by von Campenhausen:

The hierarchical structure of the Church is by now something so long established that Origen would never dream of questioning it. It is for him a sacred datum based on divine revelation; but it also corresponds to a universal and necessary cosmic law of moral and religious growth. All spiritual natures on their way upward towards God are bound by the law of gradual development through various stages each of which brings them closet to their goal; in the course of this progression they are constantly in need of governance and guidance and the helpful co-operation of other beings already at a higher stage.⁸⁸

In the end, then the office-holder is worth to the Church at large simply what he as a man of the Spirit can bring to his task.

Does not Origen here remove the Spirit as source of personal grace in intellectual wisdom and practical charity from the graciousness displayed in shared and structured symbolic activity in the liturgy of the Church? Yet all grace is from the same holy and life-giving Spirit, so one can hardly remain happy with such a 'solution'. For Afanasev, all ministry is charismatic, but this does entail that all ministry is a matter of individualised charisms. For him such a view would overthrow the incarnate, and therefore public, and so communitarian and symbolic nature of Christian salvation.

The elusive quality of Origen's portrait of the Church and ministry is of a piece with his world-view as a whole which may be described not unfairly as 'Existentialism avant la lettre'. All things are in movement up or down a ladder of anagōgē, towards or away from the one God. Their ousia depends on where they have reached on the ladder: the quality of a creature's theōria of the One bestows on it its 'nature'.⁸⁹ In this Middle Platonist ontology rendered Existentialist by marriage with a radical doctrine of freedom it is difficult to find a place for stable covenanted, institutional manifestations of grace. In this respect, Origen's picture is corrected by the work of Denys, whose language at first hearing resembles Origen's but whose underlying presuppositions are of an entirely different order. Nevertheless, an Origenistic sub-tradition in ecclesiology lived on within the Byzantine church. It is found most notably in Symeon the New Theologian, a figure who, on the one hand, appears fully at home within Byzantine Christianity in its developed mediaeval form, and yet who, on the other, shows a freedom vis-à-vis office and order, especially in the sacrament of penance, that in the West would be highly redolent of the Reformers' critique of Catholicism.⁹⁰ Yet is there not a touch of such Origenism

about Afanasev's own opposition to the idea of an ontological sacramental 'character'? If ecclesial grace has ontological implications should we not expect that the ordering of the Church's ministries will have too? ⁹¹

f. Cyprian

The evaluation of Afanasev's use of patristic materials has no more crucial locus than his characterisation of Cyprian. According to Afanasev, it was Cyprian who, over-influenced by the world-state aspirations of the Roman imperium, took the fateful step of re-making the 'traditional' ecclesiology in its image. ⁹² The 'universalist' model of the Church steps on to the stage, the local church receding to the status of a part within the whole. By a natural progression, therefore, Cyprian began to think (at first, unwillingly) of the Church as a monarchy of which the Roman bishop is the head. ⁹³ Although elements of the universalist picture may be found in the Didache and in Origen, the first clear articulation of its principles was Cyprian's (fateful) achievement. ⁹⁴ It remained for Augustine to consolidate this achievement and (we may suppose) to secure its victory in the West by dint of his own enormous influence on the subsequent theological activity of the latin Church. Afanasev does not indicate how he thinks the selfsame account of the Church came to be dominant in Orthodox manuals in the modern period; but in fact it is clear that however it emerged in the West, it did come to have a great (though not necessarily a preponderant) influence by the later Western Middle Ages (Gallicanism being the main pocket of resistance) and entered the ecclesiology of the Eastern churches through their use of Catholic textbooks in the age of the Counter-Reformation and beyond. The placing

of Cyprian at the fountain-head of this 'unitary' ecclesiology must entail a claim of a far-reaching sort for his importance. It becomes especially vital, therefore, to determine to what extent Afanasev's reading of Cyprian is correct.

Before turning to the writings of Cyprian it may be well to make one general a priori point at the outset. Cyprian's life-setting in the North African church, his profound veneration for Tertullian, and his experience of two major persecutions by the Roman state, that of Decius and then Valerian's, conspire to make it unlikely that he would have regarded the political structures of the Roman empire as a model for the life of the Church. What could be asserted plausibly of Eusebius of Caesarea in this regard, is prima facie implausible when ascribed to Cyprian.⁹⁵ The endemic dislike of the superficially Romanised Punic and Berber population of North Africa for the Roman imperial government played a major part in the later Donatist movement, but it may reasonably be supposed to have pre-existed that movement, being the corporate response of an imperfectly colonised people.⁹⁶ The North African Christian tradition reflected this dislike in the sharpened form of hostility to a persecuting state. Veneration for the martyrs was a substantial feature of North African Catholicism, its excesses combatted with varying success by the episcopate.⁹⁷ When a North African ecclesiology emerges with Tertullian, its portrait of the Church is as little Eusebian as can be conceived. The Church for Tertullian is an eschatological reality, the community of sanctified men and women who are bound here and now to lead the life of Christ in expectation of Him who is to come.⁹⁸ In his Exposition of the Lord's Prayer, Tertullian offers a brief ecclesiology: significantly, on reaching the words qui est in caelis.⁹⁹ The concept of heaven in Tertullian includes both the Kingdom of God, soon to come in power,

and the present citizenship of Christians in this Kingdom, i.e. the Church. It is because the Church is already a heavenly reality that Tertullian regards it as totally separate from secular society and can specify a whole range of activities and occupations unfitting¹⁰⁰ to the citizens of a more-than-earthly society. Given Cyprian's well-documented veneration for Tertullian, it seems a priori probable that these attitudes would have been communicated to¹⁰¹ Cyprian also. If so, they would surely have been hardened by Cyprian's experience of the Diocletianic persecution, not to mention the further troubles in the reign of Valerian which cost him his life.

However, and still remaining in the territory of Cyprian's background, it should be noted that Afanasev's thesis is capable of re-formulation in a way which makes greater sense for the historical time and place it concerns. Not because of admiration for the Empire but because of competitive hostility to its claims the African church may have seen itself as an inverted, rather than mimetic, image of the Roman authority. There is some reason to think that this is so in Tertullian's case. Christ is for Tertullian the 'imperial commander' to whom the Christian soldier (i.e. the Church member) owes complete obedience. The Gospel is 'our own law' over against the law of the empire. This law makes the Christian plebs into an ordo, an ordered society with due governmental forms. The honor or public office of the Christian ministry gives them consensus, the right to adjudicate matters affecting the life of the body; this is especially so with the summus sacerdos, the bishop, the one who presides at the sacrificium of the Eucharist. All of these Latin terms are drawn from Roman imperial administrative practice but their use in Tertullian is ironic rather than straightforwardly analogical. In this sense it is possible to speak of the Church of

Tertullian's vision as a 'shadow empire' over against the Roman state.¹⁰² Nevertheless, the Church of Tertullian is not envisaged on the universalist model, much less is his ideal a governmentally unitary body. The unity of the Church for Tertullian rests on the fact that all local churches accept the binding authority of the regula fidei,¹⁰³ the rule of faith handed down by the apostles. In every church where the faith of the apostles (expressed above all in the possession of the Scriptures) is received, there the Church in the fullest¹⁰⁴ theological sense can be found. The traditio of the regula fidei passes from the apostles, who are its original auctores to a succession of monarchical bishops in every church of apostolic foundation; In other churches founded since the close of the apostolic age the same is true, since these churches were planted by the directly apostolic churches and agree with them in adhering to the same rule of faith. It will be seen that this ecclesiology is at base an ecclesiology of the whole present in the part, the whole Church in the local church, for each local church in possessing the regula fidei is as much 'church' ontologically as is the whole Church spread throughout the world. This is in fact an interesting example of a particularist or intensivist ecclesiology (where the local church is equivalent intensively to the whole Church) that is not based on appeal to the nature of the Eucharist as in Afanasev's theory.

We must turn now to Cyprian himself, in the expectation that he will fit in some way into this background, although it would be deterministic to assume from the outset that he cannot depart creatively from it. Cyprian took from Tertullian a number of features: a thoroughly eschatological vision of the Church; an exaltation of martyrdom; the Church as the inverted image of the idolatrous State; a use (partly analogical, partly ironic) of Roman law concepts to analyse the structure of the Church; and finally a point de départ in the idea of the

local church. To this he added notions of his own: the retrenchment of the idea that the Church shares in the achieved holiness of the last times (admitting that, in the light of the numbers of sacrificatores and libellatici during the Decian persecution, there are 'tares' in the Church, and consequently re-situating the Church's holiness in the ecclesial purity of the episcopate);¹⁰⁵ the expansion of Tertullian's notion of the episcopate (to include not only 'ownership' of the right to interpret the Scriptures but a wider ecclesial authority since the bishops succeed to the apostles vicaria ordinatione); and finally, the working out of a much fuller notion than Tertullian's of the communion of all local churches in the one Church.¹⁰⁶ It is because Cyprian has a much more pronounced interest in the Church's unity than his African predecessor that Afanasev has been led to believe that Cyprian's departure point is something other than the local church.

As Adrien Demoustier showed, it is Cyprian's notion of the episcopate which is the key to his creative transformation of the Tertullianic heritage, a transformation which enabled him to work out an account of the Church in which both the local church and the one Church present in the local church receive their full due.¹⁰⁷ His is, as should emerge, a highly satisfactory integration of particularist (or 'intensivist') and universalist (or 'extensivist') perspectives, deriving from, or perhaps issuing in, a subtle ontology of the Church's being.¹⁰⁸ We may come to grips with the primary problems of Cyprian's ecclesiology by asking two questions: Firstly, is the centre of unity for Cyprian the local bishop in the local church, or is it, as Afanasev alleges, at first the connexio of the bishops and later the universal primacy of the bishop of Rome? (It seems from Afanasev's account that he accepts the authenticity of both the Textus Receptus of the De

unitate ecclesiae and of the Primatus Textus with its more strongly papalist colouring). Secondly, has Cyprian substituted a juridicial 'unitarism' for a more ancient intensivist and sacramental view of the Church? The difficulty in answering these questions lies, as so often in patristic theology, in the occasional nature of Cyprian's writing, but an answer may be attempted nevertheless.

Cyprian's view of the episcopate in the period before the rise of Novatianism can only be glimpsed from a passing reference in Letter 3.¹⁰⁹ It appears to have been as 'Ignatian' as Afanasev could desire. There is an obligation to obey the bishop because God himself has established him in the community as the link between the people and himself; to gether around another altar than the bishop's altar is to sin against the one God.¹¹⁰ A little later, in the period of African Novatianism, Cyprian is found insisting that each church is a hierarchically ordered society founded on Peter, the first of the apostles. By divine institution there can only be one church, and thus one bishop in any given place.¹¹¹ When Novatianism spreads to Rome and claims the papal chair in the person of Novatian himself, Cyprian replies that communion can only be with pope Cornelius as - since there is only one bishop and that by succession - the first elected candidate must be the true bishop.¹¹² But in this (third) period Cyprian is not simply concerned to affirm the unity of episkopē, ministerial oversight, in the local bishop. He points out that the Church does not exist in one place only but is the totality of all local churches. Her unity demands that each local bishop be in union with the rest. This 'inter-communion' founds the unicity of the episcopate, and this unicity, along with the unicity of episcopal activity in the local church, is a necessary condition for the unicity of the Church herself. By the choice

that it imposes - to support Novatian or Cornelius - the Roman schism will divide the bishops and thus the Churches and so call into question the unicity of the Church. The Roman crisis, then, made Cyprian define his doctrine of collegiality. It is not sufficient for a bishop to be legitimately elected in his local church for him to be a true bishop in the Petrine succession. If a legitimately elected bishop separates himself from his co-bishops, he separates himself from the unity of the Church. This is why Cyprian devoted so much anxious energy to convincing his African colleagues of the need to support Cornelius at all costs.¹¹³

Cyprian lacks two notes of the later 'developed' Western ecclesiology of conciliarity: he has no conciliar theory, though he has a regular practice of holding councils.¹¹⁴ Nor does he think that the common episcopal office gives one local bishop a right and duty to care for other flocks not his own (and then a similar right and duty for his).¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, he does hold that each bishop must respect the Church's unity in the way just described, and that, taken together, the bishops as a body have charge of the whole Church. The difference between Cyprian's view of the latter and that of the full-scale universalist picture outlined by Afanasev is that for Cyprian the bishops taken together, as a body, have nothing that the single bishop lacks. As the De unitate ecclesiae lapidarily puts it: Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.¹¹⁶

Moving on to the latter part of Cyprian's life, the period of pacification after the collapse of Novatian's party and finally the controversy over baptism, we find Cyprian refining and developing the basic lines of these doctrines. Cyprian stresses more and more the importance of the union of all local churches, and connected with this, of the unicity of the Church - Ecclesia una, but not in such a way as

to lose sight of his own starting-point in the life of the local church since as a successor of the single episcopate of Peter he has the capacity to realise the unity of the body. He must be united to the other bishops, but the episcopate he possesses is simply that which all share together. Here, one equals all. As before, Peter is the origin of the episcopate of each bishop in each place. Yet the local church is not now envisaged in an isolated way but in its rapport with the whole Church. Each church is the whole Church, in the sense that the one and entire Church of Christ is entirely present in each as united to the rest. By a Petrine and apostolic succession, each church is identical with the original Church, and for this reason all the churches taken together form one single reality, despite the fact that they are dispersed in space and time. The Many co-exist, therefore, in the One, and so Cyprian applies to the universal Church the Pauline image of the body which he has already used for both the local church united around the bishop as successor of Peter and the unity of the bishops as successors of the apostles. This is the burden of the formula of Letter 55 cited by Afanasev:

A Christo una ecclesia per totum mundum in multa
membra divisa¹¹⁷

It should be clear by now that, far from being the slogan of a thoroughly universalist ecclesiology, this formula is part of a polyvalent application of the body image to a reality which is one and many at different levels.

This becomes clearer still from a consideration of the
(not easily dateable) letter Ad Fortunatum and the De unitate Ecclesiae.¹¹⁸
In the former, unity is realised in the Church by the inter-communion of the particular churches on the condition that each remains in communion

with its origin, the apostolic Church of Peter. Thus communion between local churches does not merely signify the unity of the Church; it positively realises it - which is what we would expect on a 'particularist ecclesiology'. Nevertheless, it does not realise the Church's unity by itself. Each Church must preserve its identity with the common origin of all, which it does through episcopal succession which is, therefore, the condition of possibility for this actually realised unity through inter-communion. The Church now, in other words, is both one and many. Turning to the De unitate ecclesiae it becomes clear that for Cyprian the Church always was. Both versions of chapter 4 agree on this assertion and in the same words:

Hoc erant utique et caeteri (apostoli) quod
fuit Petrus.

With this we may usefully compare a phrase of chapter 5:

Ecclesia una est quae in multitudinem latius
incremento fecunditatis extenditur.

The one and the many are found in the original episcopal college, and so quite naturally they are found again in the later Church which draws its life from that 'fertile' source. Thus Demoustier could sum up Cyprian's picture in these words:

Dès l'origine, l'unique épiscopat est possédé
tout entier par chacun et par tous ensemble.
Les premiers évêques - les apôtres - possédaient
chacun la plénitude de l'épiscopat et participaient
tous du même pouvoir dont l'unicité a été fondée
sur Pierre. Demeurant unis dans l'exercice de cet
épiscopat, ils accomplissent l'unité de l'Eglise;
ils étaient cette première et unique Eglise du Christ.
La succession, à la fois pétrinienne et apostolique,
perpetue et cette possession par chacun de la plénitude
du pouvoir (super Petrum) et cette intercommunion de
tous dans l'unique épiscopat (per apostolos). En chacun

des évêques se trouve le pouvoir de tous. Ainsi la communion avec un évêque est-elle communion avec tous; en communiant avec son pasteur, le fidèle d'une église communie avec tous les fidèles de toutes les autres églises: l'appartenance au corps d'une église est appartenance au corps totale.

Therefore, Demoustier concludes:

Toutes les églises sont par succession et par union mutuelle identiques à l'église originaire et réalise actuellement ce qui était déjà à l'origine; l'intercommunion dans l'unité d'un seul corps de nombreuses parties dont chacune est identique à tout. 119

So, in relation to the first part of our first query about Cyprian: there is no need to choose between regarding the local bishop as centre of unity of the Church, and seeing the connexio of the episcopate at large as that centre of unity. For Cyprian, pace Afanasev, the second does not displace the first but rather qualifies it in a way which enriches it, while removing nothing of its significance.

What then of the second possibility mentioned by Afanasev in connection with the status of the local church in Cyprian, that of the 'monarchical' tendency in Cyprian's portrait of the Roman bishop and his role in the scheme of things? This obliges us to come to some decision about the standing of the variant form of the De unitate ecclesiae known as the 'primatial text'. Given that Cyprian did not substitute for an Ignatian vision of the local church 'with-its-bishop' a purely corporatist system of general episcopacy to which the local church and bishop are tributary: nevertheless, at some stage did he not re-conceive the Church along the 'monarchical' lines of a society governed by the Roman bishop, what Afanasev calls a 'necessary concomitant'?

to the theory of a universal episcopate - for a body must needs have a head. ¹²⁰ There can be no doubt of the great importance attaching to the Roman see in Cyprian's eyes. Even the baptismal quarrel with pope Stephen manifests the weight which Cyprian placed on relations between Carthage and Rome. Before the crisis, the seriousness with which he viewed Rome's position among the churches had already been demonstrated in his stand over Novatian's claims as anti-pope. In principle, it is possible that Cyprian's interest in Rome depended on Rome's civil position within the empire. Since so many local churches had doings with Rome, a Roman schism would - purely empirically - divide the Church more successfully than any other. But it is also equally possible that Cyprian regarded Rome as occupying a theologically unique position within the inter-communion of episcopally ordered churches. Scholars confessionally or temperamentally hostile to 'Roman claims' have noted quite correctly that for Cyprian every local church is founded on Peter and has the same power as Rome. ¹²¹ But while this is true, Cyprian says of no other church that it is the locus Petri or the cathedra Petri. ¹²² The key to resolving the problem lies in what Cyprian has to say about the significance of Peter vis-a-vis the other apostles, yet they received theirs after him. His chronological priority over the college is the foundation of its unicity: it makes it numerically a single college. The apostles are one college because, while being in solidarity with each other, they are also in solidarity with the first to whom apostleship was given: Peter. The best explanation for a number of Roman references in the Letters (leaving aside for the moment the De unitate) seems to be that for Cyprian the Roman church preserves or represents this chronological

priority and so authority of Peter in unifying the other churches in communion with her.

Navigare audent et ad Petri cathedram atque
ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis
exorta est. 123

It is for this reason that Cyprian can call the Roman church the 'root' or 'mother' of the churches.¹²⁴ While other churches are founded on Peter, no other (as far as Cyprian is concerned) has been founded on Peter by Peter himself. As the primus, Peter's role is to manifest (ostendere) the origin of the unity of the apostles - for Christ did not found as many churches as there were apostles.¹²⁵ Just as the apostles received the single episcopate by entering into solidarity with Peter who had received it first, so the bishops of the churches retain their due episcopate by entering into, or remaining in, communion with that church whose foundation is the most ancient. The Roman church inherits the one role which is Peter's alone (in contradistinction to the other apostles), namely, to manifest the unicity of the Church. Rome is thus the sign of the presence of the 'root' (Peter as unifier) in the communion of the bishops. Although the unity of the bishops (and through them the unity of the churches) is not achieved through communion with Rome (but through fraternal inter-communion and the direct succession of each from the common source), nevertheless, it is only by communion with the Roman church that the bishops know and can demonstrate that they are united amongst themselves, and that this unity is the same as that which Peter himself signified at the beginning. Rome is thus for Cyprian the necessary centre of unity because it is the necessary sign of this primordial unity.

This interpretation of Cyprian's view of the Roman see, drawn from his Letters, enables us to say that both versions of the De unitate may be authentic. Both versions are compatible with Cyprian's doctrine as thus expounded. The one piece of external evidence we have about the book from Cyprian's pen, in Letter 54, implies that there may well have been two editions: the work, having been 'read' at Carthage was later dispatched, Cyprian tell us, to Rome. The thesis of Dom John Chapman that the Textus Receptus is the Carthaginian edition of the book, and the Primatus Textus a later Roman edition takes on a certain plausibility from these two premises.¹²⁶ The differences between the two editions may be explained by postulating two different audiences. The Carthaginian version envisages a divided episcopate, and is addressed to bishops; the Roman version envisages a divided flock and is addressed to the laity.

Finally, we must turn, but more briefly, to the second major question which Afanasev's presentation of Cyprian raises in an acute form. Did Cyprian's concern with authority lead him to replace a sacramental by a juridical conception of the Church? Has he an ontology in terms of law and power? The great Cyprianic images for the Church - mother, body, house of God - should alert us to the fact that there is something here deeper than the merely juridical and institutional. For Cyprian, the Church belongs to that peculiarly privileged reality which he terms sacramentum: in his thought, that term indicates the activity of Christ presenting itself through some reality perceivable by us. According to Cyprian, the Church is made by the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist which are not simply liturgical rites but actions of God himself in and through the symbolic gestures performed by the Church. Thus Demoustier can write, citing

De dominica oratione 4,

L'Eglise n'est donc pas seulement la réalité
sociologique juridiquement organisée par la
hiérarchie épiscopale; L'Eglise à qui s'adresse
Cyprien pasteur, est d'abord l'assemblée eucharistique
qui se forme 'quando in unum cum fratribus convenimus
et sacrificia divina cum Dei sacerdote celebramus'. 127

In this regard the bishop's importance lies in his being the ministerial
condition for the baptismal and eucharistic life; the connexion
bishop-Eucharist is ever allusively present in Cyprian's writing.
Because of the need to discern where the Eucharist is truly celebrated
- that is, where it is celebrated within the unity of Christ's seamless
garment, episcopal intercommunion has a vital role to play vis-a-vis the
Eucharistic life.

At a deeper level of analysis still, the ultimate foundation of
the Church's unity in Cyprian's eyes is the unity of the triune Lord
of the Church. Cyprian transposes to the level of ecclesiology the
images of the tree, the spring and the sun used by his master Tertullian
to express the Father's hypostatic particularity as source of the Son
and Holy Spirit and in this sense unifier of the Godhead. 128 The Church
as mother received from Christ as Bridegroom the ability to bring
forth new sons and daughters; she is radix, fons, sol, just as at the
level of the divine processions the Father is the inexhaustibly fertile
source of Son and Spirit. While the generative power of the Church is
established first of all in baptism it comes to its fruition in the
Eucharist. There the Trinitarian unity founds a human unity, the
vinculum concordiae of the Eucharist celebrated by those in communion
with the bishop. The articles of Père Adrien Demoustier on Cyprian's

ecclesiology which have been largely followed here might well be, though they are not, a deliberate response to Afanasev's hesitations about Cyprian. Their conclusion warrants citation as a whole for this reason:

... si l'Eucharistie^e comme sacramentum signifie que le Christ réalise cette unité divine de l'assemblée, l'évêque est le garant que cette assemblée-là, réunie ici, maintenant, est la même que celle de la Cène et que toutes celles qui en dépendent par succession dans le temps. Il est la signe que l'Una Mater féconde de son origine divine cette assemblée. Ce serait-il responsable de l'abandon d'une conception plus ancienne de l'Eglise fondée sur l'Eucharistie?

Demoustier continues, in answer to his own (largely rhetorical) question:

L'aspect polémique de son oeuvre aurait pu égarer tel ou tel de ceux qu'il influença. Mais sa pensée reste ferme alors même qu'elle n'est pas toujours explicite. Il y a le fondement 'spirituel et céleste' de cette unité: La Trinité qui se communique dans l'unité du Christ ex utroque genere. Mais l'Eucharistie est le passage de l'une à l'autre. Par elle ce que signifie l'unité sociologique devient réel, puisque l'assemblée du corps ecclésial autour de l'évêque offrant le pain et le vin est le symbole du Christ offrant à son Père le corps et le sang de l'humanité, la nôtre en même temps que la sienne. Par elle, l'unité trinitaire, en la personne du Fils qui se rend présent, réalise le symbole, donnant ainsi sa propre réalité à ce que n'a pu que figurer l'assemblée. L'assemblée cultuelle donne à l'assemblée sociologique sa réalité comme figure de l'unité divine dans le Christ. L'unité trinitaire donne à la figure la réalité qu'en elle-même celle-ci ne pouvait que figurer. ¹²⁹

In this masterly passage there is perhaps a certain tendency to 'read into' Cyprian the Augustinian and Thomist analysis of sacramental reality, sacramentum et res. Nevertheless, Cyprian's writings do contain the seeds of the developed Scholastic flower: the ultimate reality of the Eucharist, that for which it exists, is the unity of the Church. In the public world, to which both rite and concord, both liturgy and society, belong, the Eucharist needs its episcopal guardians. The mystery requires the institution and even the law. These serve a unity which at the deepest level is created by the Dominical sacrament par excellence. The episcopal inter-communion cannot create that unity; nevertheless, in a world where concord is never secure, the bonds it fashions serve a unity which is in the last resort eschatological and divine.

g. Augustine

Considering the richness of Augustine's writing on the Church (essentially divisible into three periods: first, apologetic writings, especially vis-a-vis Manichaeans and philosophically-minded pagans; second, the polemical treatises against the Donatists; thirdly, in the context of a theology of history), it is surprising that Afanasev did not extend his interests in African ecclesiology beyond Cyprian to Augustine. It seems that he was content to note, in an early essay, that Augustine had continued Cyprian's 'universalism' in ecclesiology, and to leave it at that. Except, that is, for one point but the point is a major one, both in Afanasev's work and in Augustine's. From Afanasev's earliest writing, in his Serbian phase, the theme had appeared of the essential difference between a polity based on law and a polity based on grace. Afanasev held that in the course of the Church's history, which despite the Spirit's presence is a history subject to the vagaries of process and contingency in this world, the

ethics of law and the ethics of grace or charity had become confused. The de facto development of canon law was an instance of this confusion between two diverse realms. So was the phenomenon of State Churches, the direction of churches by temporal rulers of the kind which the Church in Russia had suffered until the February Revolution of 1917. Afanasev could not but find Augustine's doctrine of the two cities congenial in this context. There is, therefore, in Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo a remarkably positive assessment of Augustine, which contrasts sharply with the bleak presentation of him found in a number of modern Orthodox writers. 130

Afanasev does not offer a very full account of Augustine's two cities. His principal concern is to show that by means of the doctrine of the civitas terrena, with its inner law of self-love and its will to power, over against the civitas Dei with its inner law of charity and humilitas, Augustine distanced himself in the clearest way imaginable from the 'imperial theology' which so marked the patristic Church after the conversion of Constantine. There can be little doubt that Afanasev is correct in isolating the figure of Augustine here as representing the fullest counter-statement in the patristic age to the theology of empire produced by, above all, Eusebius of Caesarea. The background of the imperial theology lies, as Francis Dvornik amply demonstrated, in attitudes to the figure of the emperor in the Hellenistic world. 131 In a sophisticated, Hellenised version of the theocratic concept of kingship in the ancient Near East, the emperor as sovereign was held to be the 'animate law' and the empire a mirror of the divine realm. 132 The Alexandrian Christian tradition stressed, following a hint in the Pauline letters, that the pax

augusta was a Providential condition of the Incarnation and the spread of the Church. Clement in particular espoused Philo's idea that the emperor, as the icon of the divine Steersman of the universe, could be regarded as participating in a special way in the powers of the Logos.¹³³ But the full working out of the theme had to await the conversion of the emperors to Christianity. For Eusebius, the emperor is the special friend of the Logos. His task is to bring the knowledge of the Logos incarnate to the ends of the earth. Aside from this missionary dimension, the emperor also has a role within the Church, namely to secure its peace and unity.¹³⁴ Although the author of the De laudibus Constantini and the Vita Constantini was to some extent working out his own personal notions here, it must be recognised that this imperial theology was also a reflection of the actual historical events. The early Councils were in some sense an imperial creation: probably they were technically in civil law meetings of the imperial Senate in its ecclesiastical aspect.¹³⁵ The decision to construct as Constantine's mausoleum a 'church of the Twelve Apostles', symbolically reinforcing the Eusebian concept of the emperor as isapostolos, the 'equal of the apostles', may have aroused opposition, however, reflected in later interpolated versions of the Vita Constantini which considerably toned down the original 'high' language.¹³⁶ But the liturgical privileges of the emperor, which continued in East Roman practice until 1453 and are the subject of unfavourable notice by Afanasev went unchallenged in the Christian East.¹³⁷ Even before Augustine the opposition shown to them by Ambrose of Milan is notable and, of course, Western.¹³⁸

While it is unlikely that Augustine ever accepted the imperial theology in anything like its full form, he does seem to have had a

concept of tempora christiana in which the advent of the Christian emperors was seen as a decisive fact, in some sense a prolongation of the biblical history of salvation.¹³⁹ But by the time he began writing the De Civitate Dei Augustine had abandoned this notion for a more restrained and nuanced picture. Essentially, Augustine brings together various elements from his tradition and his own reflection and weaves them into a whole which can be called the first really satisfactory patristic theology of history. These elements are, the (partly biblical, partly Manichaeic) imagery of two cities or kingdoms, the members of which declare their citizenship through a life devoted to good or to evil as the case may be;¹⁴⁰ the picture of the Church formed by reflection on the corpus mixtum of a pastor's flock, and particularly fully worked out in the wake of the Donatist crisis;¹⁴¹ the continuing influence of the North African eschatological ecclesiology of Tertullian and Cyprian,¹⁴² and the theory of biblical (and prophetic) inspiration which Augustine had formulated through his meditations on the nature of the authority of Scripture.¹⁴³ So, taking these elements in that order, we may say that for Augustine the Church is to be defined in relation to the City of God, whose way of life (amor Dei, amor proximi) she represents on earth. She contains, however, wheat and tares, those in whom her faith and sacraments are not efficacious because in their own deepest orientation they belong to the other, and competing, city, the civitas terrena. Nevertheless, she will one day be purified, at the eschaton, and stand forth as the spotless Bride of Christ. Until then though every member of the Church can and must use what discernment is given him, there is no final judgement on any man, or any group, or any inner-historical event concerning the Church since the Spirit of prophecy spoke in Scripture and only there. Between the apostolic age

and the Parousia we can have no new revelation, and so no direct access to the divine view of this-worldly events.

Augustine's view of the earthly city, and so of the empire, is implied by his description of the heavenly city, and thereby of the Church. Augustine no more identifies the empire with the civitas terrena (in a 'non-dialectical' way) than he identifies the Church with the civitas Dei. Nonetheless, just as the Church is directly related to the civitas Dei (not least through the Eucharist where the 'prince' of the City of God stands as Mediator in her midst),¹⁴⁴ so the empire is directly related to the civitas terrena. Powered by the libido dominandi, the empire is of its essence incapable of Christianisation except in some formal sense. The compacts and covenants made by rulers may in fact bring about the realisation of some values - often enough through prudence rather than authentic charity, as honour among thieves; but the nature and finality of power after the Fall precludes for Augustine its transformation by grace. It is indeed the antithesis of grace, its anti-type: to see what grace is not, we may look at power. Augustine is far from resurrecting the ferocious anti-imperialism of early Christian apocalyptic; still, it is inconceivable for him that the imperium, the res publica as such should become Church. Individual officers within it may be and act as members of the Church, the emperor Theodosius amongst them. But this for the mature Augustine is a world away from the imperial theology of a Eusebius. As Professor R. A. Markus has written:

The earthly city has its own, unifying, social bond, located somewhere among the pervers, self-centred and temporal purposes aimed at by its members. Their common allegiance to such fleeting values, even though it be, in the end, divisive, suffices in Augustine's eyes to constitute them a genuine society. But it is a

society which, again like its heavenly counterpart, does not appear visibly as a society until the last judgement at the end of time ... Rome can only be called the earthly city in a secondary or derivative sense, in so far as the Empire is a society organised around loyalties with no positive relation to God. To accomplish this identification Augustine dwells on the idolatry of pagan Rome, on the lust for power and the quest for human glory and renown ... But Augustine was also acutely conscious of the limits of rhetoric ... 'What is Rome but the Romans (Sermons 81,9)? ... When 'our night whelms, whelms, and will end us', then the two cities will at last be disentangled from their interwoven existence in the saeculum.' ¹⁴⁵

Augustine's contrast of the cities, and with them Church and empire, is not explicitly related to the Pauline contrast of grace and law. It is remarkable that a mind so steeped in Paul's doctrine of the gracious predestining initiative of God did not articulate this relation. That it did not may be tentatively related to Augustine's pastoral realism. All men begin life as children, with childish ways, and by education they are drawn out to affirm for themselves the values originally imposed on them in the form of external norms and laws. The Augustinian 'Rule' is clear evidence that for Augustine the typical or mature Christian lives by the inner law of grace; nevertheless, it is equally clear from Augustine's episcopal practice that he regarded canons, conciliar decrees, official sanctions of many kinds as appropriate instruments for moulding the common life of the Church.

It follows from this that while Afanasev has correctly grasped the principal lines of Augustine's distinction between the two cities, and the fact that this distinction challenges the Eusebian tradition in Christian historiography at its most central point, he has also added

an element which is not found in the historical Augustine. The contrast of law and grace in the inner life and motivation of the individual believer is not in fact extrapolated to the corporate plane of the Church's life as a community in the way Afanasev seems to think. He departs from Augustine to offer a view of his own, a further extension of Augustinianism whose aim is the outlawing of all concept of legal norm and sanction in the Church. As we have seen, Afanasev's extremely favourable idea of canon law, and 'high' doctrine thereof, in the essays of 1933-6 was abandoned by him during the Second World War as he brooded more and more on the insight into the eucharistic nature of the Church that came to him in the winter of 1932-3. Given that both the Orthodox Church, to which Afanasev belonged, and the Catholic Church, which inherited the mainstream Augustinian tradition know nothing of such an outright hostility to the very notion of canons for the ecclesial community, one is tempted to look instead, insofar as sources external to the author must be postulated, to a line of scholarship which insists that the institutional element in Christianity is alien to its original impulse. In order to explain the increasingly 'institutional' tone of Acts, the Pastoral Epistles and much early Christian writing outside the New Testament canon, the spectre of Frühkatholizismus began to walk the land. Since in Afanasev's case, what is deemed to be wrong with the evolution of the patristic Church is the 'juridicisation' of the Gospel community, it will be best to deal with this under the rubric of his use of the Byzantine canonical tradition.

h. Denys

The ecclesiology of Denys is certainly one of the most unusual to

reach us from the patristic age, chiefly because of its author's insistence on clothing his writing in an idiom drawn from the Neo-Platonist writer Proclus.¹⁴⁶ In this regard, Denys' ecclesiology is of a piece with his theology as a whole. His account of evil and of providence is highly Proclean; his angelology, with its central idea of the Word of God reaching man via the mediations of successive angelic orders also has a neo-Platonist colouring. His mystical theology, too, is indebted to the neo-Platonic corpus in its depiction of the divine unity from which all things flow and to which they return. His theory of the three ways in prayer - purgative, illuminative and unitive - rests on a Platonic tradition with roots in Plato himself. The doctrine of ecstasis as giving perfected souls: even in this world an intuitive (though not comprehensive) vision of God would be at least highly welcome to the disciplines of Proclus. In all this, it is a question both of a Neo-Platonist organisation of biblical materials (Denys' awareness of the authority of Scripture and Church tradition is clearly and frequently expressed) and also a matter of importing of Neo-Platonic tenets, and a natural theology, into the heart of Christianity.¹⁴⁷

The pivot of Denys' theology, and so of his ecclesiology, is the union of man with God by deification. From this fontal idea of his flows his principal organising category, that of the hierarchies - angelic and ecclesiastical, the latter modelled on the former. Each is destined to bring us to theōsis by henōsis with God.¹⁴⁸ In Denys' account, the law of graduation reigns everywhere, in heaven as in the Christian community, in the world of nous as well as in the world of sōma. (There is a point of contact here with Origen). The angelic

hierarchy Denys divides into nine choirs (three groups of three) which transmit the divine Light to each other on a descending scale of closeness to the uncreated Source. Similarly, in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, there are three successive degrees of ministry, those of bishop, priest and deacon. These orders are differentiated by their differing roles in relation to the sacraments, for it by the sacraments or 'mysteries' that our deification is begun, continues and is brought to its completion. Baptism is its opening and foundation, and the Eucharist (which Denys ascribes, Afanasev-like, to the ministry of the bishop, the principal proestōs) is the means of its achievement.

Afanasev's interest in Denys lies chiefly in the latter's account of baptism.¹⁴⁹ The baptised are for Denys within the ecclesiastical hierarchy: it is to them that the phrase 'the hierarchy' refers. As yet the 'sword', as Afanasev terms it, of the doctrine of consecration by the sacrament of Order (leaving the royal and universal priesthood in some sense in the world of the profane) has not yet cut off the plebs sancta Dei from their presidents in the Lord. Denys does indeed stress in the De hierarchia ecclesiastica that the hierarchy of the Church 'comprises one and the same power across all its hierarchical functions', mian echei kai tēn autēn dīa pasēs tēs hierarchikēs pragmateias tēn dunamin.¹⁵⁰ The gift which the angels have received in a single, utterly simple, way (the gift of God's self-communication), the tradition of the Bible has transmitted to us in a way adapted to our humanity, namely through the 'manifold variety of different symbols': en poikiliā kai plēthei diaretōn sumbolōn.¹⁵¹ The apostles received from the triune God the fullness of the 'holy gift' of saving grace and were charged with spreading it to others. This they did by

communicating the single mystery through a multiplicity of signs, a manner of proceeding as well-suited to the human order as it would be out of place in the order of the angels.

tēn kath' hēmas de horōmen analagōs hēmin autois
tē tōn aisthetōn sumbolōn poikilia plēthuomenen,
huph' hōn hierarchikōs epi tēn henoiedē theōsin en
summetria tē kath' hēmas anagometha, theon te kai
theian arretēn.¹⁵²

Far from entailing a sacramental materialism, Denys' teaching stresses the need to dispose ourselves properly for receiving these signs of grace: a demand which he equates with the command to 'keep my words' of the Johannine Christ. It also stresses the continuous love of God which the 'unifying presence' of God in the sacraments should bring. Such fidelity to the means of grace and love of God is, he says, the 'common term' of all hierarchy, whether human or angelic: hapasēs de touto koinon hierarchias to peras.¹⁵³ Moreover, and in a fully New Testament manner, he accords the divine love the prior initiative in this enterprise.

In the De hierarchia ecclesiastica II we have Denys' account of the liturgy of baptism which Afanasev draws on for his statement about the 'establishment' of the royal priesthood by that sacrament. The 'mystery of illumination' constitutes Christian initiation, and founds the 'mystery of communion', that is, the Eucharist. Denys' sense that these two principal sacraments structure an entire economy of grace in the Church, and bestow on each person who receives them a new dignity, and, through the entire symbolic structure which undergirds them and surrounds them, a new vision of God and the world in their inter-relation (theōria), is very close to Afanasev, even though the conceptual and literary idiom could scarcely be more different. Of all the patristic ecclesiologies we have surveyed, Denys' has the closest links to Afanasev despite the modest role it plays in his writing.

Afanasev's patristic renaissance: a conclusion

Afanasev can hardly serve as a full or even a balanced introduction to the patristic writers whom he cites. But it is not his intention to write a history of patristic ecclesiology. He has his own portrait to paint, even though in painting it he is indebted to the images of others for much of his own iconography. The elements of various patristic writers are re-assembled and juxtaposed in an ensemble which is not meant to be simply a kaleidoscopic impression of the early Church but also to suggest how it might be appropriate to see the pattern of life of the contemporary Church. Afanasev sought a Church which would be Ignatian in its respect for the local church and the bishop, Irenaeus in its concern for the witness of the church in priority, Tertullianic in its conviction that the Church is inbreathed by the Holy Spirit. Such a Church should be Dionysian in its sacramental realism, and Augustinian in its refusal to marry the Church to the world. For the Didachist, Origen and Cyprian, Afanasev has less time. This division into two camps is not based on any corporate judgement by the Church (as an 'ecclesiastical writer' rather than, strictly speaking, a 'father', the later Tertullian is at least as vulnerable on this criterion as is Origen). It is based rather on the relation of these two galleries of figures to the universalist ecclesiology which Afanasev so strenuously opposes. We have found reason to think that the two 'models' of eucharistic and universalist ecclesiology co-exist side by side in these authors rather more than Afanasev would like to think. At the same time, this judgement, if correct, calls into question the idea that an adequate ecclesiology could be created on one of those models, the eucharistic -

or, as we have also termed it, particularist or intensivist - alone.

In conclusion, an attempt may be made to specify the nature of Afanasev's patristic ressourcement. What place do the Fathers hold among the loci theologici of his work? Perhaps the best description of Afanasev's attitude to the patristic witness occurs in an essay of Père Yves Congar O.P.: 'Les saints pères, organes privilégiés de la Tradition'.¹⁵⁴ The Fathers for Afanasev are privileged, but not infallible, guides to the Tradition of Christianity whose own primary expression is found in Scripture. There is no doctrine of the consensus patrum in Afanasev; nor is there an appeal to later Church teaching as a way of sifting the good from the bad (or the less good) in their theology. They are approached as sources of illumination, but they are also judged in the light of principles deriving (Afanasev holds) from Scripture itself. The chief idea in debate is the notion that the Church of the Holy Spirit is the local church celebrating the Eucharist around the figure of its proestōs, a notion which Afanasev considers to be fully warranted by the New Testament evidence.

It will be seen at once that in terms of fundamental theology, or of what constitutes theological authority, there is a certain ambiguity in his position. For what could be said to one who simply disagreed, on the basis of reading the same New Testament Scriptures, that the structure of the Church in apostolic times was as Afanasev describes it? Let us suppose that all participants in the resultant conversation would agree that the witness of the Fathers is a subordinate standard of faith compared with the witness of the Scriptures. Nevertheless, do not the Fathers have a super-ordinate role in terms of the discernment of the Scriptures vis-à-vis the individual believer, either as simple reader

of the Scriptures or as exegete? The common consent of the Orthodox (and Catholic) tradition here has been to answer, Yes. But if they have such a role, by what principle does Afanasev choose to privilege certain fathers (above all, Ignatius of Antioch) and to disenfranchise others (the author of the Didache, Origen as ecclesiologist, Cyprian).¹⁵⁵ If Afanasev be taken to withdraw himself from the common tradition so far as to say that the Fathers do not have a super-ordinate role vis-à-vis the individual Churchman or scholar, then his appeal to the patristic age becomes a purely historicist one. That is, its 'authority' is simply the authority of a principle arrived at exclusively from within historical science itself, namely that the closer people are to some historical phenomenon (in this case, the origins of Christianity) the more acceptable is their account of it.

A moment's reflection will show that this principle is in itself highly debatable. Investigation of the hermeneutical process suggests that in certain respects the opposite of the principle is likely to be true. The passing of time opens up a space for reflection in which the significance of an historical event can display itself.¹⁵⁶ The tradition of responding to the event is inseparable in interpretation from the event itself. This is part of what is meant by saying that the event belongs to the human (and not simply the physical world). In this sense, the Incarnation, by involving God in accepting all the conditions of entering the human world, including hermeneutically-relevant conditions, entailed a divine decision that the significance of what was done in the humanisation of the Word would only be fully understood in retrospect. But what is true of the Incarnation will be true of all the actions of the Word Incarnate, both in his historical

ministry and in his glorified, Spirit-filled, state. It will be true then, of the foundation of the Church.

The uncertain way in which the principle of appeal to the Fathers operates in Afanasev's writing is both cause and effect on his central, possibly obsessive, concern with one idea, an idea whose importance to him is bound up with the history of Russian Orthodoxy and so is partly autobiographical. At the back of Afanasev's mind is the notion that a State-territorial church must be avoided at all costs. But any 'extrinsically universalist' account of the Church might lend itself to territorialisation and Erastianism since a 'part' of the 'whole' Church could conceivably be organised in separation from the rest. Therefore, any tendency towards extrinsic universality in the picture of the Church offered by the Fathers must be played down. In the early centuries, the term 'Catholic Church' must be regarded, wherever possible, as attached exclusively to the local church in which the mystical reality of Christ's body, flowing as this does from the celebration of the Eucharistic Body, appears on this earth. Afanasev set out to trace the outlines of an Orthodox ecclesiology of a (theologically) new kind. Insofar as this ecclesiology could not be described as simply a reflection of the common teaching of the Fathers, but is an evaluation of that teaching in which some ancient writers speak more clearly than others, Afanasev could not appeal purely to the consensus patrum as the authoritative ground of his reading of Scripture. To express his evaluation Afanasev turned to patristic studies as an ancillary discipline in Church history. This was a subject which had attained considerable maturity in the Russia of the late nineteenth century, and which was even more flourishing in the German and French-speaking West of the inter-war years.¹⁵⁷ But

at the level of Church history, the theologoumenon Afanasev wished to propose to dogmatic theologians became simply a hypothesis about the mentality of the early Church. And, notoriously, there is a fine line in scholarship between holding an imaginative hypothesis leading¹ to the illumination of the data, on the one hand, and thraldom to an idée fixe on the other. In attempting to identify the sanior pars of the Fathers dogmatically considered with the mainstream tradition of the Fathers positively or historically conceived, Afanasev risked, and risks, pleasing nobody. Nevertheless, the intrinsic interest and importance of his thesis about the patristic church is such that profit may be gained even from its exaggerations.

Excursus: Afanasev and the Byzantine canonical tradition

Afanasev is surely correct in regarding canonical sources as - at least putatively - theological sources. Canon law may be regarded as 'implicit ecclesiology'. In periods when a specific literary genre of treatises de Ecclesia did not exist, it was natural that the theological articulation of the meaning of 'Church' should be found, inter alia, in commentaries on the canons.¹⁵⁸ In addition, the canons themselves are a witness to the sense of the Church in a given period. Afanasev's use of canonical sources is considered at this particular point because the canonical tradition, in its main lines, was established in the patristic period and partakes to some degree in the authority of that period for the later Church. This is the age when the faith, worship and ordered existence of the Church were crystallised. Commentaries on the canons of the patristic age do not have an equivalent authoritative force, yet, like later canons, they testify to the theological life of the post-patristic Church and so form part of Tradition.

Before considering Afanasev's approach to his canonical materials, it will be appropriate to offer an historical overview of the state of the canonical tradition in the period that interests him. The origins of the differentiation between Western and Eastern canon law lie in the sixth century. By that century, collections of papal decretals, regarded as bearing the same weight as synodal decrees as early as the pontificate of Siricius, 384-399, were being added to conciliar canonical collections in the West, but not in the East.¹⁶⁰ In the East, prior to the reign of Justinian, and leaving aside Scripture itself, which

after all contains references to the discipline of the earliest communities, we have 'canonico-liturgical collections' and the canonical determinations of various councils.¹⁶⁰ The canonico-liturgical collections group together liturgical prescriptions, moral precepts and disciplinary rules. The principal members of this literary family are the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, the Canons of Hippolytus, the Apostolic Constitutions, the Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Didascalia of the Apostles.¹⁶¹ The (eighty-five) 'Apostolic Canons', a recurrent feature of Byzantine canonical collections, consist of forty-seven canons drawn from the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, itself probably a Syro-Palestinian work of the mid-fourth century, to which have been added thirty-eight further canons drawn from the councils of the first four centuries. Relevant to Afanasev's post-1934 critique of the canonical enterprise is M. Metzger's explanation of this development in terms of the 'legislative vacuum' of the sub-apostolic churches.

Les réunions conciliaires sporadiques sont loin de fournir un code disciplinaire complet, et cependant les difficultés abondent: conflits d'autorité, divergences doctrinales, initiatives nécessaires mais contestées ... Le recours au patronage apostolique garantit la valeur des solutions proposées.¹⁶²

Equally momentous for the future, however, is Justinian's decision to legislate for the Church, appealing in effect to the Constantinian principle that the emperor is responsible for the public peace and order of the Christian community. But his Codex repetitae praelectionis, Book I of which dealt with Church affairs, and his later Novellae, of whose number thirty-four are of ecclesiastical concern, had little impact outside the borders of the Roman empire. It was in Justinian's reign that the first systematic collection of canonical texts was made in the East, a Nomocanon 'in LX Titles', now lost. Around 550, in the

wake of this early attempt at systematisation, John of Antioch (sometimes called John the Scholastic) produced the first extant collection with any claim to completeness, the Synagōgē 'in 1 Titles'. This comprises the Apostolic Canons, together with the canons of the first four Ecumenical Councils (plus or minus one or two canons added in the aftermath of those Councils or subtracted because of papal non-ratification), canons from certain local synods and, finally, canons inferred from the letters of Basil the Great. John also composed a tractate of eighty-seven chapters on civil laws of the empire relevant to religious issues. When he became Constantinopolitan patriarch in 565, the Synagōgē 'in 1 Titles' became the established canonical collection in Byzantium.¹⁶³

Around 630, the Nomocanon 'in XIV Titles' was compiled by an anonymous hand and soon acquired an unrivalled position. Noteworthy is its clear separation of the canons from civil legislation even though, unlike John of Antioch, its author does include both within the same book. The second edition of this work, produced in 883, added canons taken from the Council in Trullo of 691, the Second Council of Nicaea of 787 and the Photian councils of 861 and 879, but not the anti-Photian council of 869. It was also influenced by the Ecloga of Leo III and Constantine V, a resume of Justinianic legislation. Its tendency to amalgamate ecclesiastical and civil legislation is especially pertinent to Afanasev's comments on canon law.¹⁶⁴ Slightly later than the second edition of the Nomocanon 'in XIV Titles' comes the Basilika, Leo VI's compilation of imperial laws summing up and extending the legislative work of the Macedonian dynasty, much of which affected the Church. In 920 the patriarch Nicholas Mystikos' council of Constantinople

which regulated the issue of third and fourth marriages, a delicate point in imperial-patriarchal relations at the time, deemed the Nomocanon 'in XIV Titles' to be the single authoritative collection of the canons. In 1080 a third edition of the Nomocanon was produced by Theodore Besta and incorporated cross-references to the Basilika, thus injecting an even larger dose of civil law.¹⁶⁵ Thus opens the great century of Byzantine canonical commentaries, the twelfth, the period of Afanasev's favoured sources: Theodore Balsamon and John Zonaras.

It will be seen from this overview that Afanasev's strictures on the genesis of the canonical tradition as a non-evangelical importation of the secular world into the community of grace are not equally applicable, even at the empirical level, to all periods in the development of that tradition. While it is true that the canons had the force of law within the Roman empire a clear distinction was made at least in the early period between the ecclesiastical authority to issue canons (which might then be promulgated by the emperor) and the civil power. Both the work of John of Antioch and the anonymous compiler of the Nomocanon 'in XIV Titles' maintain a clear and ecclesiologically vital distinction at this point. Unfortunately, under the influence of the theory of the total symphonia of Byzantine emperor and patriarch this distinction became blurred in later times. Byzantine sources show a remarkable oscillation between 'Caesaropapist' or 'Caesaroprocuratorist' views of the Church and a true 'dyarchy'.¹⁶⁶ In many Byzantine writers, the unity of the empire was presented as essential to the unity of the Church.¹⁶⁷ Indeed, the emperors, conscious of a responsibility

for preserving the unity of faith, itself the most decisive principle of the unity of the empire, ascribed to themselves in practice if not in theory a sporadic doctrinal magisterium.¹⁶⁸ The Ecloga of 726 describes the emperor, accordingly, as the Church's pastor.¹⁶⁹ On the other hand, the existence of a dyarchy is recognised in Justinian's legislation where the ideal is seen as consonantia or symphonia between the two authorities.¹⁷⁰ In the Epanagōgē, a late ninth century work, possibly by Photius, Church authority is accorded full independence in its own sphere.¹⁷¹ Although this document was never made into an official manual, the increasing weakness of the empire after the Seljuk occupation of Anatolia in 1072, and the Latin seizure of Constantinople in 1204 assured that the patriarchal and synodal structure of the Byzantine Church would come more and more into its own. Similar fluctuations between imperial and episcopal authority in the matter of legislation punctuate the history of the Russian church also. As Afanasev's unpublished lecture materials on the history of Russian canon law demonstrate, he was deeply read in the area. Doubtless he felt that it offered no 'solution' different from the Byzantine experience.

But even had the principle of dyarchy been faithfully observed throughout Church-State relations in Christian history, Afanasev's difficulties about the role of canon law in the Church would scarcely have been resolved. For two distinct questions were at stake. Firstly, there is the question of the right and duty of the Christian emperor to legislate for the Church community. Afanasev rejects such a notion on the reasonable ground that the imperial office cannot be regarded as a differentiation of the apostolic ministry. It cannot be related to

the Eucharist. It cannot, therefore, in his view, be considered as a distinct charism within the royal priesthood. This clear rejection of the Eusebian theology of the emperor's God-given role in the Christian oikoumenē leads Afanasev to his positive evaluation of Augustine's writings on the relation of Church to empire in the De civitate Dei.¹⁷²

But secondly, there is also the question as to whether the life of the Church, as a community of grace, can ever be appropriately expressed in the form of canons, rules, laws, since grace when expressed in Christian practice is agapē, charity, of its nature unspecifiable in legal terms.¹⁷³

It is because Afanasev eventually found himself unable to accept a compatibility of any kind between law and the community of charity that he does not consider more benignly the less Eusebian canonists in the East, such as Zonaras, or indeed the almost entirely non-Eusebian canonical tradition in the West. We must now turn to his use of specific canonists.

a. Theodore Balsamon

Theodore Balsamon is the most frequently mentioned of the Byzantine canonists cited by Afanasev. Born at Constantinople, Balsamon became a cleric of the 'great church', Hagia Sophia, attaining the post of chartophylax, a kind of vicar-general, in 1179.¹⁷⁴ He was appointed patriarch of Antioch by the emperor Isaac Angelos but was unable to take up his see because of the Crusader presence. It is not known whether he lived to see the seizure of the capital by the Latins in 1204. If he did, the event would have sharpened his already strong anti-Latin animus. Balsamon's most important work is his commentary on the Nomocanon 'in XIV Titles' written at the behest of the emperor Manuel Comnenos and the Byzantine patriarch Michael Anchialos.

Balsamon takes as his text the second edition of 883 which, as we have seen, took the major innovatory step of integrating civil legislation with ecclesiastical.

C'est surtout le principe qui est important: les lois imperiales ne sont plus en sous-ordre, mais pénètrent dans la systématisation elle-même sur un pied d'égalité avec les autres decrets des conciles et évêques. ¹⁷⁵

Balsamon believed, wrongly, that this second recension was the work of the patriarch Photius. He followed its spirit faithfully.

For Afanasev Balsamon is an imperialist who would forbid people, or encourage them to forbid themselves, the practice of their full sacramental rights in the Church. At stake is Balsamon's commentary on the Apostolic Canons, especially canon IX, and his exegesis of the Council in Trullo, the Constantinopolitan synod of 691-2 which saw itself as completing, at the canonical level, the work of the fifth and sixth ecumenical councils and whose canons, though by no means all ratified at Rome, had been added to the Nomocanon in its later form. Afanasev deplored Balsamon's insistence that while the emperor, as Christ's earthly vice-gerent, has full liturgical rights in the eucharistic sanctuary the Christian people are neither to enter there nor to communicate themselves. Admitting that other Byzantine canonists permit self-administration in case of necessity, Balsamon had written:

I think otherwise: for one cannot permit such a liberty on the base of (mere) interpretations or contradictions. ¹⁷⁶

Afanasev is evidently glad to read of Balsamon's own failure to get canon LXIX of the Council in Trullo put into practice. He tried to prevent lay people entering the sanctuary but they stood their ground.

How is it possible that at the divine sanctuary of the glorious church of our Lord Jesus Christ on the island of Chalkis anyone who likes may enter in? I know not ... But mark well this rule, and do not allow laymen to enter into the church's sanctuary. However, I myself made great efforts to prevent laymen from entering the sanctuary of the church of my holy Lady, the Mother of God Hodegitria, but without success. They told me it was an ancient custom which one could not forbid. ¹⁷⁷

But Afanasev's greatest anger is vented on Balsamon's comment on Apostolic Canons IX which prescribed that:

All the faithful who enter into a church and listen to the reading of the Scriptures but do not assist at the Prayer and at the holy communion, must be excommunicated as sowers of disorder in the Church. ¹⁷⁸

Afanasev points out that, as more clearly with Canon 2 of the Antiochene council of (c) 341, the context here is that of those faithful who came to the eucharistic synaxis but did not communicate. Balsamon regards this canon as impossible of realisation: those who do not communicate out of scorn or pride might be declared excommunicate but not those who fail to communicate out of piety and humility. ¹⁷⁹ Pointing out the exhortation to frequent, and even daily communion is found in such prestigious sources as the Letters of Basil the Great, ¹⁸⁰ Afanasev's comments on Balsamon:

Tout ce qui fut la base même de la vie du christianisme primitif était devenu impossible à réaliser au XIIe siècle. Chez Balsamon, le mot 'impossible' montre, d'une façon plus frappante que ses beaux discours, à quel point la conscience chrétienne avait évolué ... ¹⁸¹

Afanasev overlooked, however, Balsamon's answers to the patriarch Mark of Alexandria in which he gives his opinion that all people without exception, whether clergy, monks or layfolk, might be allowed Holy Communion daily, provided that they had prepared themselves for it by leading holy lives.¹⁸²

b. John Zonaras

John Zonaras is the other of the two Byzantine canonists cited by Afanasev. Little is known of his life but he held an important court position under the emperor Alexis Comnenos until his entry into the religious life at the monastery of Hagia Glykeria.¹⁸³ He probably died soon after 1150. In order of time he is the second of the triumvirate of Byzantine canonists whose judgements are still noted in Eastern Church practice, working shortly after Alexis Aristenes, the first great commentator on the Synopsis Canonum, but before Theodore Balsamon who knew and used his work. Zonaras' tendency is towards a benign interpretation of the canons and he is notably less 'Caesaroprocuratorist' than is Balsamon. His method is notable for its recourse to history, especially institutional history, when elucidating the canons. He may well indeed be the author of the Epitomē historion, an historical manual reaching from the Genesis account of creation to the accession of the East Roman emperor John Comnenos in 1118. Byzantinists have recognised this to be a workmanlike piece, making excellent use of the manualist's sources.

We must now look at the use Afanasev has made of Zonaras' work. As we might expect from the above summary, Zonaras escapes more lightly than Balsamon. The points at issue are pretty well the same:

canon LXIX of the Trullan council, Apostolic Canons IX and the cognate canon II of the Antiochene council of 341 found in the collection compiled by Meletius of Antioch and known as the Antiochene Corpus canonum. On the first, Zonaras remarks mildly that, strictly, the emperor should not, as a layman, enter the sanctuary, but 'because of his authority and his dignity' an exception is made.¹⁸⁴ On the ninth Apostolic canon, Zonaras simply says that in his day it was not rigorously obeyed: on the issue of communion-when-ever-at-the-sunaxis while Zonaras makes it clear that in his time there was widespread opposition to frequent communion on grounds of piety, he does not really indicate his own attitude to this. More probably, he thinks it an insufficient reason for not communicating - and so occupies Afanasev's own standpoint.¹⁸⁵

The modest total of Afanasev's references to the great Byzantine canonists hardly permits his readers to obtain a satisfactory overview of their work.¹⁸⁶ However, Afanasev's own lack of sympathy with them is sufficiently clear. As he puts it:

On a tenté de trouver des fondements théologiques
au droit sans jamais y réussir jusqu'ici.¹⁸⁷

Afanasev's use of canonical materials, as his attitude to the canon law in general, came to be affected by his reading of the Lutheran historian of canon law, Rudolf Sohm. Sohm's foundational thesis was that Church and law are mutually exclusive concepts.¹⁸⁸ This opinion, stated on the very first page of his Kirchenrecht brought him considerable notice, as did his attempt to show historically how such allegedly contradictory notions could have become inter-twined. Sohm's learning, as well as the elegant simplicity of his fundamental concept, gained a wide readership for his ideas both in Protestant

and Catholic circles.¹⁸⁹ Moreover, as early as 1906 a Russian translation of Sohm's principal work appeared in Moscow.¹⁹⁰ It was translated in part by the polymath priest-philosopher Pavel Florensky who cites it in his Stolp i utverzhdenie istiny.¹⁹¹ Sergei Bulgakov, himself influenced by Florensky, also devoted some attention to Sohm, mainly negative.¹⁹² Sohm's own ecclesiology was founded on the concept of the people of God. Just as the Old Covenant knew only one gahal, so the New knows only one ekklēsia, 'die Volksversammlung der gesamten Christenheit'.¹⁹³ And yet, Sohm points out, we use the word 'church', following New Testament practice for individual congregations also. He finds the solution to this riddle in the thought that

das Wort Ekklēsia keine bestimmte empirische Grösse, keinen sozialen Begriff (auch nicht den Begriff Orts-gemeinde), sondern lediglich ein dogmatisches Werturteil ausdrückt. Ekklēsia heisst jede Versammlung welche dogmatisch, für den Glauben, ihrem geistlichen Werte nach, eine Versammlung des neutestamentlichen Bundesvolkes vor und mit Gott (Christō) dargestellt. Zugrunde liegt das Wort des Herrn: Wo zwei oder drei in Christi Namen versammelt sind, da ist die ganze Christenheit mit allen ihr zuteil gewordenen Verheissungen, denn Christus ist in ihrer Mitte, welcher alles in allem ist. Wo Christus ist, da ist die Ekklēsia (das Volk Gottes).¹⁹⁴

The single ecclesia has, at the empirical level, countless Erscheinungsformen, epiphanies of itself which take the form of worshipping assemblies. Originally, these gatherings were independent and structureless affairs. Only in the course of time did they become formally constituted Gemeinden, bound to a single monarchical bishop. This process is the birth of that form of the Church which Sohm dubs

Altkatholizismus, defined by him as a Verrechtlichung, 'jurisdiction' of the Gospel. Sohm takes Ignatius of Antioch to be the archetypal representative of this falsification of the original ecclesia. The freedom of the Christian gathering is dissolved by Ignatius through a concern for obligations to a hierarchical order of bishop, presbyter and deacon, a consideration so all-important that without the bishop there is no longer the reality of the Church. The bishop's presence has replaced that of Jesus Christ in the Matthaean logion as the sine qua non of ecclesial reality. Here, according to Sohm, the entire structure of later canon law is present in nuce.

Weil das Urchristentum nur den religiösen Begriff der Kirche hatte und folgeweise diesen Begriff auch auf die äusserlich sichtbare Christenheit anwandte, ist mit der Entstehung von Rechtsordnung für die Christenheit ...
· naturnotwendig aus dem Urchristentum der Katholizismus hervorgegangen. 195

It remained for Cyprian of Carthage to complete the image and organisation found in Ignatius. Just as the unity of the local assembly is found for Ignatius in the monarchical bishop, so the unity of all such local assemblies taken together is found by Cyprian in the unity of the episcopal order. In the mediaeval period, a further step is taken. The transformation of the 'old Catholic' into the 'Roman Catholic' church came about through the canonising of relations of precedence between stronger and weaker local churches. Through Fürsorge on the part of the former and Rezeption on the part of the latter, metropolitanates grow in authority. But if these are to be the terms of a struggle for paramountcy, the Roman church was virtually predestined to victory.

Seit dem Jahre 70 ist der Stern Jerusalems untergegangen.
Seitdem hat Rome bis in das 4. Jahrhundert die Führung der Christenheit in seinen Händen getragen. Rom war die 'befestigte', die grosse, die leistungsfähige, die entscheidende Gemeinde allen anderen Gemeinden gegenüber. 196

The renaissance of Roman law at Bologna in the twelfth century enabled the Papacy after Gratian to present itself as the supreme governing organ of a Church conceived on the model of a society or corporation.

Although Afanasev departs from Sohm in seeing the episcopally-ordered eucharistic assembly of Ignatius as the model of an authentic early community, while for Sohm the primitive congregation is structureless and lacking office-holders, he agrees with him in regarding the emergence of canon law, and the power-relations it both expresses and enables, as the primary de-naturing agent at work in the Church's history. Afanasev's strictures on a juridical ecclesiology that would lay stress on the power of the apostolic ministry to govern has a certain Byzantine background in the context of Greek polemic against the claims of the Roman church, especially in the period of the reunion movement of 1204 to 1439. In a major fourteenth century text combatting the concept of papal plenitudo potestatis Peter and the apostles are declared not to have acted by any power of an administrative kind. Instead, their actions were authoritative insofar as they were carried out under the impulse of the Holy Spirit.¹⁹⁷ But such Byzantine statements hardly call into question the general possibility of canon law. Afanasev's attraction to Sohm is better explained by reference to the struggle of the Slavophiles with the Erastian image of the Russian church after Peter the Great. A comparison with a writer from a similar background, Sergei Bulgakov, is instructive. In his earliest ecclesiological essays, Bulgakov spoke of the Church as a union of faith and love and even as an 'anarchic' union. But during the crisis of the structures of church life in Russia in the years 1917 to 1922 he came to see the insufficiency of a purely mystical conception of the Church's fellowship.

Il commence à chercher les principes de l'existence de l'Eglise dans l'histoire parce que les descriptions jusqu-là employées par lui-même, comme par exemple 'l'union de l'amour dans la liberté' ou 'l'organisme mystique', lui semblent concerner seulement une Eglise invisible. Il voit maintenant dans les définitions des slavophiles l'opposition à l'état d'oppression dans lequel vivait l'Eglise de la Russie des tsars. Bulgakov souligne la nécessité des formes extérieures de l'Eglise, indispensable pour qu'elle soit perceptible et unie. ¹⁹⁸

Afanasev failed to realise that Sohm, so far from being a presupposition-less historian, was working within a politico-theological framework of a definite kind. Writing in a Lutheran context in Bismarckian Germany, Sohm was deeply influenced not only by Luther's account of the contrast between Law and Grace but also by a particular view of State sovereignty. In the two Kingdoms, charity is free, and overflows into the limitless benevolence of the justified sinner, while law is imposed, and confines itself to minimal standards of human conduct on threat of sanction by the Prince. ¹⁹⁹ However, Afanasev, by repudiating the distinction between divine, unchangeable elements in the canon law and human, changeable ones, created for himself a virtually intolerable situation as an ecclesiologist concerned with the theological foundations of canon law. ²⁰⁰ It was, perhaps, inevitable that, in repudiating this distinction, and neglecting such concepts as the Eastern oikonomia or the Western dispensatio, Afanasev came to consider not only the Byzantine canonical tradition, but all canon law, a disastrous subversion of the Church's life.

Chapter V, An ecumenical evaluation of Afanasev's ecclesiology

Afanasev's work, as described in Chapter III of this study, could prompt ecumenically valuable reflection in a number of areas, ranging from the role of the Holy Spirit in the mystery of the Church to the genesis and development of the ordained ministry. But not every theme with a rooting in his books and essays is constitutive, as distinct from illustrative, of his ecclesiological approach. Thus, for example, though the origins and history of the Christian ministry engaged a good deal of his attention, its interest to him lay principally in the idea that ministry is determined by relationship to the Eucharistic assembly. In what follows four 'constitutive' themes have been identified, each being of considerable interest to both Orthodox and Catholics concerned with the reconciliation of the traditions. These are: the concept of eucharistic ecclesiology; the problem of the inter-relation of universality and particularity in the being of the Church; the relation of doctrinal magisterium to its popular 'reception'; and the role of the Roman papacy in a re-united Church.*

I. The Eucharist as the Church's foundation

The idea of constructing an ecclesiology on the basis of the sacrament, and liturgy, of the Eucharist is first fully expressed in the 1934 essay 'Dve idei vselenskoï tserkvi'. As described above, this essay pleads for a restoration of 'Ignatian' ecclesiology, where catholicity is qualitative,

not quantitative, in character. Appealing to the dominical logion in Matthew 18, 20 on Jesus' presence where eisin duo ē treis sunēgmenoi eis to emon onoma, Afanasev contends that this 'gathering' is realised in the Eucharistic assembly. The whole Christ is present in the Eucharistic Gifts, and as a result, the fulness of his body, the Church, is found in each ecclesial community that celebrates the Eucharistic mysteries, a community consisting, in essence, of people and bishop. Afanasev's fundamental conception is all the more powerful for its simplicity. It is, as Peter Plank puts it, 'eine grosse Idee', which, despite its unilateral character, 'bietet eine grandiose Intuition von der Kirche'.¹ Afanasev has rediscovered, after his own fashion, the ancient insight that Eucharistia facit Ecclesiam. However, while sharing in a wider revival of eucharistic sensibility in both the Orthodox and Catholic churches, Afanasev remains, in his systematic programme, a distinctive voice. In this section, the biblical and traditional basis of his 'intuition' will be set forth, with a view to indicating its capacity to serve as the foundation for a renewed ecclesiology acceptable in both West and East.

An analysis of the two New Testament traditions in regard to the institution of the Eucharist, the Pauline-Lucan and Matthaean-Marcian accounts of the Last Supper should bring out a threefold literary background in the Sinai covenant narrative of Exodus 24, 8, the Jeremianic oracle in Jeremiah 31, 3 and the Servant Songs embedded in the book of Isaiah. The eucharistic banquet appears in the light of these texts as a sacrifice and meal of covenant, and this must mean, then,

the formation of a new religious society, a new people of God. As P. Coppens has proposed, Jesus founded his 'Church' during the Last Supper as a Kultgemeinschaft, comparable to the creation of Israel as a nation of priests at Sinai. But because this cult-community is founded on the sacrificial gift of his person, it takes on the further aspect of a caritative communion: the new covenant is based upon the supreme witness of charity.² The inter-weaving of eucharistic and ecclesiological motifs is particularly striking in the theologies of John and Paul. In John, the discourse on the Bread of Life is not only sapiential, but eucharistic and ecclesiological.³ The same may be said of the mashal of the Vine and its branches in the Last Supper address.⁴ Oscar Cullmann has revived Loisy's thesis that the Johannine Footwashing scene is eucharistic, while also carrying an ecclesial reference.⁵ The flowing forth of blood and water from the riven side of Jesus in John's passion narrative may well have both Church and Eucharist in view.⁶ The co-presence of these referents in the Gospel is confirmed by the evidence of the Johannine Apocalypse, where the heavenly Church is presented as a transfigured eucharistic assembly.⁷ Bruno Forte has summarised the theological significance of such Johannine texts by stating:

Il 'dimorare in Christo' operato dalla manducazione eucaristica fa Chiesa, al punto che dove c'è Eucaristia, c'è Chiesa - Eucaristia come segno di ecclesialità. L'unità, vertice dell' aspirazione di Gesù nella sua preghiera sacerdotale, ha una radicazione anzitutto eucaristica. Chiesa ed Eucaristia sono unite nel loro nascere e nel loro crescere. L'Eucaristia è luogo d'incontro fra la Chiesa peregrinante e la Chiesa celeste, ed insieme esprime nella sua concretezza locale la Chiesa in cammino.⁸

The Johannine menein, abiding, in Christ achieved through the

Eucharist has its Pauline equivalent in the relation of disciples to Christ as head. For Paul too the sacrifice of Jesus brings about a wonderful koinōnia: the Spirit which exalted Jesus' humanity animates at one and the same time Jesus himself and each of the baptised. In J.M.R. Tillard's words:

... là où plusieurs organismes vivants sont traversés par le même et unique souffle de vie, il y a un unique corps. De même ici: l'ensemble des baptisés forme dans et par l'Esprit-Saint donné par Jésus un unique Corps, le Corps de Christ.⁹

In the Captivity Epistles, Paul expresses this insight in the metaphor of Christ as head. Originally conceiving Christ as kephalē in terms of a 'politological' principle, Paul moves over to an understanding of head as vital principle. In Hellenistic medicine, the head was regarded as the source of vital influxes animating the body.¹⁰ Incorporation in Christ the head as a member, and animation by the same breath of life as gives life to him, makes the Christian a true sharer in the mystery of God or, in Paul's own language, an adopted son. But while Hellenistic ideas drawn from various contemporary disciplines inform Paul's use of 'body' language:

le corps dont il est question et que nous sommes est bien le corps réel eucharistique.¹¹

How were these biblical data further developed in West and East? Henri de Lubac's Corpus mysticum: l'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au moyen âge showed that while the phrase corpus mysticum is not used for the Church in the Latin fathers, the inter-relation of Church and Eucharist is clearly affirmed by

them, most notably by Augustine.¹² According to Augustine, the virtus, 'power', of the Eucharist is unity. The Eucharistic presence has as its rationale the uniting of believers to each other through their union with Christ. The Eucharistic sacrifice unites the whole redeemed city to the Father by introducing the Church's self-offering into that of the only Mediator. By feeding on the Eucharistic body of Christ, we become his ecclesial body. Sermon 272 offers Augustine's fullest account:

Corpus ergo Christi vis intelligere, apostolum audi dicentem fidelibus, Vos autem estis corpus Christi et membra. Si ergo vos estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa Dominica positum est: mysterium vestrum accipitis. Ad id quod estis, Amen respondetis, et respondendo subscribitis. Audis enim, Corpus Christi, et respondes, Amen. Esto membrum corporis Christi, ut verum fit Amen.... Recolite quia panis non fit de uno grano, sed de multis. Quando exorcizabamini, quasi molebamini. Quando baptizati estis, quasi conspersi estis. Quando Spiritus Sancti ignem accipistis, quasi cocti estis. Estote quod videtis, et accipite quod estis. Hoc Apostolus de pane dixit. Jam de calice quid intelligeremus, etiam non dictum satis ostendit. Sicut enim ut sit species visibilis panis, multa grana in unum consperguntur, tamquam illud fiat, quod de fidelibus ait Scriptura sancta, Erat illis anima una, et cor unum in Deum: sic et de vino. Fratres, recolite unde fit vinum. Grana multa pendent ad botrum, sed liquor granorum in unitate confunditur. Ita et Dominus Christus nos significavit, nos ad se pertinere voluit, mysterium pacis et unitatis nostrae in sua mense consecravit.¹³

In direct or indirect dependence on the African doctor, Latin Christian writers of the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries see the relation of Eucharist to Church as one of cause and

effect, means and end, sign and reality. The same perichorēsis of Church and Eucharist expressed in Augustine's sermons is found in a catena of authors stretching from Ildephonsus of Toledo, Isidore of Seville and Gregory of Elvira in sub-Roman Spain, to Jonas of Orleans, Florus of Lyons and Walafrid Strabo in Frankish Gaul.¹⁴ The synaxis is, as de Lubac insists, 'le mystère de la communion', a communion which is simultaneously eucharistic and ecclesial: hence the double meaning of such phrases as communione accipere, communione reconciliari, a communione separari, a communione alienus. Thus communio in the late patristic and early mediaeval Latin West denotes, according to context, both reception of the sacrament and union with the Church. In Carolingian exegesis, the sanctorum communio of the Old Roman creed is at once communion with the glorified saints and communion in the Church through common participation in the Eucharist.

Communicare, participare, consortes et socios esse: le sens complexe de ces formules, constatons-le une dernière fois, se calque exactement sur le sens complexe du mot corpus. Elles aussi, au fond, désignent moins ceux objets successifs que, à la fois, deux choses qui n'en font qu'une. Car le Corps du Christ qu'est l'Eglise n'est point autre que ce corps et de sang du mystère. Il n'y a point là, à proprement parler, de jeu de mots. Par l'Eucharistie chacun s'insère en toute réalité dans l'unique corps.¹⁵

In the successive doctrinal debates of the early mediaeval West, those between Amalarius of Metz and Florus of Lyons, between Ratramnus and Paschasius Radbert, and finally over Berengar of Tours, the significant ambiguity of the term corpus to some extent collapsed. Amalarius' theology of the triforme corpus

of Christ, by not only distinguishing but separating the eucharistic and ecclesial modes of Christ's being, placed the inherited eucharistic ecclesiology under threat: hence Florus' description of Amalarius as unitati Ecclesiae inimicissimus.¹⁶ But discussion of the mode of Christ's eucharistic presence, as a natural topic for fides quaerens intellectum, could not be halted, even though it might undermine concern with the salvific function of the Eucharist. Paschasius Radbert's De corpore et sanguine Domini, intended as a comprehensive manual of Eucharistic teaching, established an entire new genre of writing. Drawing together the 'realist' passages on the presence in the Fathers, Paschasius identified the eucharistic body with that born of Mary.¹⁷ The figura or signum aspect of the Eucharist is now divested of its ecclesial aspect, and reduced to that of the 'appearances' of the Saviour's body and blood in the elements of bread and wine.¹⁸ This concentration on the mode of the presence, and eventually on a theological metaphysic suited to the expression of that mode, came to a climax in the debate between Berengar of Tours and his interlocutors, notably Lanfranc of Bec.¹⁹ A growing concern with the Christological rationale of the Eucharist, found already in Paschasius' insistence that a real eucharistic presence is absolutely required for the function of this sacrament, namely, to unite believers with the God-man in his very reality, to some degree displaces awareness of its ecclesial significance.

However, the decline of a eucharistic ecclesiology in the Latin church of the early Middle Ages must not be overstressed. As Gary Macy has emphasised, an ecclesial understanding of the

Eucharist is still found among early Scholastic theologians.²⁰ Thus Gilbert de la Porrée describes the res sacramenti, the final purpose of the Eucharist, as being that bond of the redeemed which is the Church.²¹ Later theologians connected with the Porretan school were frank in describing the Eucharist as essentially a sign of salvific membership in the Church. In a different tradition, Gerhoh of Reichersberg distinguishes between the signa of the Eucharist, the sacramental species, its essentia, the being of Christ present through the signa, and the res sacramenti, the redeemed Church-body of the Lord. Since the Eucharist is sacramentum unitatis, its res sacramenti cannot be found outside the visible communion of the Church. The sacrament of unity cannot be efficacious outside the unity it represents.²² Perhaps fearing that this ecclesial purpose of the Eucharist, if defined over against its Christological rationale might finish by eliminating explicit reference to Christ in an account of the ultimate res of the Eucharist, theologians in the school of Peter Abelard proposed that the res sacramenti is the union of Head and members in the Church.²³ The ecclesial interpretation of the rationale of the Eucharistic presence may be considered as inference from the very structure of the Eucharistic liturgy as a social ritual.

The reception of the sacrament at Christmas, Pentecost and especially Easter, was a dramatic and physically obvious witness to the unity of the Church. All members in good standing appeared in their parish churches, hopefully cleansed from sin, ready to partake of the effective sign of the community of the saved, and to pay the dues which their membership required.²⁴

That ecclesial interpretation passed into general mediaeval currency through the work of Peter Lombard whose Sententie were

the main textbook of theological students until, and in some places well beyond, the sixteenth century Reformation. For Peter Lombard, the Eucharistic res autem significata, et non contenta est unitas Ecclesiae in praedestinatiis, vocatis, justificatis et glorificatis.²⁵

Meanwhile, in the very different genre of the expositiones Missae, commentary on the Eucharistic Liturgy was utilised as a vehicle for wider theological teaching. The genre appears to have its origins in the ninth century where Amalarius' De ecclesiasticis officiis and his shorter Eclogae de officio Missae interpret the Eucharistic celebration as the Church's recollection before God of the saving mysteries of Christ's life, death and exaltation. Is it possible that this influential Carolingian figure, who was at Byzantium as Charlemagne's ambassador from 813-4 drew the idea of such a liturgically-based theology from Eastern sources?²⁶ The Latin mediaeval expositiones Missae have not been sufficiently studied to determine whether the ecclesiological understanding of the Eucharist is as well represented in them as the Christological, though the mere fact of doing theology via the rites and texts of the Eucharistic liturgy is in itself significant. According to J. de Ghellinck, 'le douzième siècle a été particulièrement fécond en oeuvres liturgiques': from Hildebert of Lavardin to Lothair of Segni, later pope Innocent III, an enormous variety of material survives, ranging from liturgical poetry to systematic commentary.²⁷

Yet by the mid thirteenth century, it is generally agreed that a vision of the Church as corpus Christi has been to some extent severed from its original eucharistic reference.²⁸

Although theologians still maintain that the proper effect of the Eucharist is unitas corporis mystici, the idea of the corpus Christi mysticum has become something of an autonomous technical expression for the Church. However, this is not to say that it is reduced to the level of a cypher. It still carries two vital theological charges. Firstly, in an age passionately concerned with unity and order the notion of corpus is set to use in contemporary social philosophy to mould an 'organic' view of human social communion; though, naturally, following up such ideas would take us down avenues of historical thought far removed from the concerns of eucharistic ecclesiology.²⁹ Secondly, as an investigation of the thought of Thomas Aquinas as the classic moment in the high mediaeval theology of the Latin West will show, the Church is still considered as effectus gratiae Capitis, with Christ as Head continuing to act visibly in his Body through the Church's sacramental mysteries, and notably the Eucharist. According to this notion, all grace found in the Church derives from the 'plenitude and pre-eminence of the grace of Christ' in such a way that in the incarnate Son God grants the faithful 'a certain similitude of the eternal, natural filiation of the only-begotten Son'.

Sicut per actum creationis communicatur bonitas divina omnibus creaturis secundum quandam similitudinem, ita per actum adoptionis communicatur similitudo naturalis filiationis hominibus, secundum illud Rom. 8, 20: Quos praescivit conformes fieri imaginis Filii sui.³⁰

This divine adoptive process is achieved through the ecclesial community as 'instrumental cause' of the grace that belongs to the new covenant. Thus Thomas, in speaking of the gift of baptismal grace, does not argue that because a man has had

his sins forgiven and received the gift of newness of life therefore he is incorporated into Christ and becomes a member of the Church. On the contrary, it is because he is incorporated into Christ the Head and becomes the Church's member that he receives new life and, with that, the forgiveness of sins.³¹ And what is said here of baptismal grace must be said of any sacrament and so of the Eucharist. In fact, what is affirmed of the sacraments as such must be affirmed supremely of the Eucharist which is, in Aquinas' words:

quasi consummatio spiritualis vitae et omnium
sacramentorum finis.³²

How this can be so may be illuminated by means of Thomas' concept of the permanent power, virtus, of the mysteries of the life of Christ. For Thomas, the acta et passa Christi, and more especially those that constitute the Paschal mystery of his death and resurrection, are the instrumental cause of human salvation: not simply a morally meritorious cause, but an assimilative, genuinely efficient one, albeit in the order of instrumentality rather than origination.³³ The historic mysteries of the life of Jesus still exercise their potency in the Church by means of faith and the sacraments of faith.³⁴ In God's service, the historic event shares in the divine eternity and ubiquity, and thus its effects can reach every time and place.³⁵ Because the virtus divina enables the original event to share in God's own non-submission to time, so the salvific virtue of the mystery can have its effect even when there is no longer any immediate embodied contact between the individual seeking salvation and the deeds of Christ's life. The effect of this in the individual will be:

une mystérieuse assimilation à l'événement lui-même,
réalisant une inclusion effective du fidèle dans le
Christ. Si, dans sa symbiose instrumentale, l'efficience

principale vient de Dieu, l'exemplarité, elle, vient précisément de l'action humaine opérée par Jésus sous cet influx divin: en nous Dieu va reproduire, par la médiation de l'événement historique dont l'efficacité demeure, ce qui s'est accompli en Jésus de par cet événement lui-même.³⁶

And it is here that the sacraments come into their own. For the sacraments do not simply illustrate the grace given, as audio-visual aids to its reception. More than this, they prolong, through their work of signification, the action of the efficient cause - the historic event in the life of Jesus - to which the Christian will be assimilated by that grace.³⁷ And this is most importantly true of the Eucharist in its relation to the death and resurrection of Christ, and to the pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit. In the sacramental effects of the Eucharistic bread and wine, the efficacy of these central mysteries of the world's salvation endures. In the Eucharist, the Word with the Holy Spirit continues to bring about those ends for which the Incarnation and the Atonement were themselves realised: precisely by forming the body of the Church.³⁸ The relation between the visible species of bread and wine (sacramentum), the body and blood of Christ (sacramentum et res) and the mystical Body and its unity (res ipsa) binds the eucharistic Body to the ecclesial. Res huius sacramenti est unitas corporis mystici. It is because the Eucharist contains the real body of Christ that it brings about the unity of his mystical body, the Church.³⁹

Dans la condition terrestre, l'Eucharistie est donc la cause propre du corps mystique, de l'unité de l'Eglise.

Le baptême dont le lien avec l'eucharistie est étroit ne fait entrer dans l'Eglise que parce qu'il est inséparable du votum eucharistiae.⁴⁰

So far comparatively little has been said of the continuing economy of the Holy Spirit. But for Thomas, the capital grace of Jesus from which the grace given to the Church's members derives is itself the work of the Holy Spirit. For while the order of activity of the Persons ad extra, both in salvation history and in the life-story of each individual, conforms to their intimate, eternal order of origin (Father, Son, Spirit), once the assumption of the soul and body of Jesus is realised by the divine Word, the Spirit can cause in him that fulness of grace which is Christ's, by way of being its immediate source. And indeed, from the moment of the Incarnation, in radical dependence on the presence of the Logos in the human individuality of Jesus, the Spirit brings about in Christ the fulness of the gratia capitis.⁴¹ Veiled until the Resurrection, this grace begins at the first Easter to shine forth in all its transforming power.⁴² The transformation concerned is carried out through that contact with the Paschal event which we enjoy via faith and the sacraments of faith.⁴³ As Thomas remarks in his commentary on John, the Spirit, being a gift of God, could only be given to friends. Thus it was necessary that we should become God's friends through the reconciliation wrought by the sacrifice of the Cross before we could enjoy that Person who is himself the Donum Dei.⁴⁴ Not surprisingly, then, in his commentary on the Eucharistic discourse in John 6, Thomas proposes a relationship between the Eucharistic body of the Lord and the Holy Spirit.

Ille qui spiritualiter manducat et bibit, fit particeps

Spiritus Sancti, per quem unimur Christo unione fidei
et caritatis, et per quem efficimur membra Ecclesiae.
Resurrectionem autem facit mereri Spiritus Sanctus.⁴⁵

While nothing like a complete doctrine of a relation between the Eucharist and the Spirit is offered here there are at least some interesting hints, indicating an awareness of that relation in the Latin tradition.

Although the post-mediaeval Western tradition was not unaware of the Eucharist-Church connexion, for instance at Trent,⁴⁶ it became a somewhat marginalised motif until the rise of the 'liturgical movement' of the early twentieth century.

Thus, writing on the eve of the Great War, J. Simon lamented:

Les auteurs contemporains semblent n'avoir pas attaché beaucoup d'importance à cette puissance unitive de l'Eucharistie. Si l'Année liturgique et quelques rares ouvrages mystiques n'avaient pris soin de la remettre en circulation, ce serait, de nos jours, une doctrine bien oubliée.⁴⁷

But the richness of the patristic and mediaeval tradition in Western Catholicism on the Church-Eucharist relation was re-expressed in that great movement of ressourcement, the Second Vatican Council. Three texts from the 'Dogmatic Constitution on the Church', Lumen Gentium, may suffice to show the role of Afanasev's 'grosse Idee' in the ecclesiology of a Council which gave such impetus to the ecumenical 'dialogue of charity', that provides the intended context for the closing section of this study.⁴⁸

Quoties sacrificium crucis, quo Pascha nostrum inmolatus est Christus in altari celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur. Simul sacramento panis eucharistici repraesentatur et efficitur unitas fidelium, qui unum corpus in Christo constituunt.

In fractione panis eucharistici de Corpore Domini realiter
participantes, ad communionem cum Eo ac inter nos elevamur.

Porro corpore Christi in sacra synaxi refecti, unitatem
Populi Dei, quae hoc augustissimo sacramento apte
significatur et mirabiliter efficitur, modo concreto
exhibent (fideles).⁴⁹

In the Greek patristic tradition, Augustine's understanding
of the Eucharist as both figura and means of the Church's unity
found ample parallel. Homilies on First Corinthians are a rich
source of material here,⁵⁰ while Cyril of Alexandria offers
perhaps the fullest statement of the theme within a soteriology
of 'divinisation'.⁵¹

In the later patristic and Byzantine periods, while the
theme of the Eucharist does not seem to have been invoked in
a conceptually self-aware way in order to provide an understanding
of the foundation of the Church, an implicit way of expressing the
same idea can be found in the practice of writing 'mystagogies'
- commentaries on the divine Liturgy which serve at the same time
to lay out a doctrine of the Church.⁵² The beginning of this
tradition appears to be the Mystagogia of Maximus the Confessor,
whose first seven chapters explore the meaning of the church-
building, while the following sixteen reflect on that of the
eucharistic rites. Characteristic of Maximus' treatise is the
simultaneous insistence on the cosmological and salvation-
historical aspects of both church-building and eucharistic
liturgy.⁵³ As Congar sums up, for Maximus, 'L'Eglise est la
totalité du "nouveau mystère", celui de notre salut ou
déification'.⁵⁴ Similarly, in the Historia ekklesiastikē kai

mustagōgikē of Germanus of Constantinople, while the altar is a manifestation of the heavenly sanctuary (in Platonic or Dionysian style), the Eucharistic liturgy is placed in relation to the historical events of the saving economy.⁵⁵ In the second half of the eleventh century the literary genre of the mystagogia reappears in the Byzantine church with the Protheoria of Nicholas of Andida, revised by his brother Theodore. Here the Liturgy is presented as a human reflection of the praise of the angels, mediated by the high priesthood of Jesus.⁵⁶ As an anonymous treatise deriving from the Protheoria, and contained in MS. Vaticanus graecus 504 shows, a doctrine of the Church is presented in such texts. The latter speaks of Church as the means whereby God has come to meet man, being seen among us and accomplishing his designs for us.⁵⁷ Curiously the later Byzantine mystagogiae, such as those of Nicholas Cabasilas and Symeon of Thessalonica 'n'apportent rien de plus au point de vue ecclésiologique', yet at least show the continued vigour of a tradition.⁵⁸

The Kievan Rus received from the Greek and Bulgar churches the developed Byzantine liturgy, along with this tradition of symbolic liturgical explanation. According to K.C. Felmy, the Russians appropriated this tradition in their own way, regarding the symbols of the Liturgy as accentuated mental images.⁵⁹ This he regards as the key to the confusions about the moment of consecration of the elements (some said at the proskomidia!) during the Muscovite controversy with Symeon Polotsky and Sylvester Medvedev. In the eighteenth century, largely through the influence of the patriarch Nikon's Skrižal of 1656, a more traditional Byzantine explanation of the Liturgy appeared,

drawing on Germanus, Cabasilas and Symeon of Thessalonica. Around the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries this process of ressourcement was deepened, paradoxically through Western channels: notably the Euchologion of the Dominican Jacques Goar, still the classic work for Greek liturgical studies. But in the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries commentary on the Eucharistic rite began to diversify. A strictly historical and scientific approach to texts and actions was favoured by Ivan Dmitrevsky, Porfiry Uspenskiy and others. The late Byzantine tradition also maintained itself, with its account of the liturgy as a representation of the vita Christi, and a consequent somewhat cavalier attitude to the texts, especially those of the anaphora themselves. Finally, with the work of Florovsky the original, early Byzantine connexion of Eucharist, ecclesiology and eschatology is restored. It is this variant which will enjoy the most brilliant future, through its handling by Bulgakov, Florensky, Afanasev himself and after him Alexander Schmemmann.⁶⁰ In the latter modern Western influences are again palpable as at so many times in the story of Russian theology: Odo Casel's Mysterientheologie was especially important here.

Indeed, in the contemporary period, Orthodox and Catholic theology has achieved a remarkable convergence, through privileging the relation of the Eucharist to the Church as a key to ecclesiology. On the Orthodox side, one has the example of such recent or living authors as, in addition to those already mentioned, Paul Evdokimov,⁶¹ Jean Meyendorff⁶² and John Zizioulas.⁶³ On the Catholic side, one may mention Yves Congar,⁶⁴ Jérôme Hamer,⁶⁵ Emmanuel Lanne,⁶⁶ Louis Bouyer,⁶⁷

H.-J. Schulz⁶⁸ and Bruno Forte.⁶⁹ It is scarcely a coincidence, therefore, that the first meeting of the Orthodox-Catholic ecumenical commission, established in 1980, should have taken as its theme 'Le Mystère de l'Eglise et de l'Eucharistie à la lumière du Mystère de la Sainte Trinité'. The 'Rhodes Document', approved by all concerned on 6 July 1982, offers in its fourth chapter a re-statement of Afanasev's 'fundamental intuition':

Les croyants sont baptisés dans l'Esprit au nom de la Sainte Trinité pour former un seul corps. Quand l'Eglise célèbre l'Eucharistie, elle réalise 'ce qu'elle est', Corps du Christ. Par le baptême et la chrismation, en effet, les membres du Christ sont oints par l'Esprit, greffés sur le Christ. Mais par l'Eucharistie, l'événement pascal se dilate en Eglise. L'Eglise devient de qu'elle est appelée à être de par le baptême et la chrismation. Par la communion au Corps et au Sang du Christ, les fidèles croissent en cette divinisation mystérieuse qui accomplit leur demeure dans le Fils et le Père, par l'Esprit.

And so, the Rhodes Statement continues:

d'une part, l'Eglise célèbre l'Eucharistie comme expression, en ce temps-ci, de la liturgie céleste. Mais, d'autre part, l'Eucharistie édifie l'Eglise, en ce sens que par elle l'Esprit du Christ ressuscité façonne l'Eglise en Corps du Christ. C'est pourquoi l'Eucharistie est en vérité le Sacrement de l'Eglise, à la fois comme sacrement du don total que le Seigneur fait lui-même aux siens et comme manifestation et croissance du Corps du Christ, l'Eglise. L'Eglise pérégrinante célèbre l'Eucharistie sur la terre jusqu'à ce que son Seigneur vienne remettre la Royauté à Dieu le Père, afin que Dieu soit tout en tous. Elle anticipe ainsi le jugement du monde et sa transfiguration finale.⁷⁰

Afanasev is right to maintain that the Church is fundamentally eucharistic, that is, it consists in the

communion of the Body of Christ in its totality and in its inclusiveness of all. Each eucharistic community reveals not part of Christ but the whole Christ, not a partial or local unity but the full eschatological unity of all in Christ. It is, as J.D. Zizioulas has said, 'a concretization and localization of the general', a presence of the katholou in the kath hekaston in the sense of Aristotle's Peri Hermeneias.⁷¹ In the eucharistic context local and universal are mutually entailing. Afanasev's fundamental insight into the Eucharistic mystery as ground of the Church's life is a remarkable recovery of the earlier tradition, both Eastern and Western. But has not his preference for, and even idealisation of, the structure of the ante-Nicene church induced in him a certain 'Eucharistic congregationalism'? We must now go on to consider his adumbration of this fundamental insight in terms of the Church as a reality at once one and many.

II. The One and the Many

Afanasev's presentation of eucharistic ecclesiology is particularly concerned with what it implies for the relation between particular churches and the Church universal. He presents this relation under two analogies. The first is drawn from Trinitarian theology: the fulness of the divine nature is found in each hypostasis of the blessed Trinity. The second is borrowed from Eucharistic theology: the plurality of eucharistic celebrations does not undermine the unity of the single sacrifice of Christ. Similarly, the multiplicity of local churches, themselves defined by their eucharistic

assemblies, does not imperil the unity of the Church: rather, the whole Church is made present in the malaya tserkov. Afanasev, then, does not deny that from earliest times Christians have spoken both of 'churches' in the plural, and of the 'Church' in the singular. On the contrary, he affirms that there is such a reality as the one or universal Church, and that it shows itself through a multitude of local churches. The question is not the 'that' of this relationship, but the 'how'. How are we to understand the One-Many relation in its ecclesiological form?

The biblical and patristic terminology of which Afanasev makes much, the 'Church of God established at', or 'residing at' or simply 'at' a given place, suggests a mutual implication between the concept of particular church and the concept of the Church universal.⁷² Thus in Paul we find the co-existence of 'church' in reference to local communities with a more absolute, comprehensive use.⁷³ What Yves Congar has called the 'mutual interiority' between particular church and Church universal has been widely recognised throughout the course of ecclesiological reflection.⁷⁴ So in the mediaeval epoch we find Peter Damian insisting on the presence of the fulness of the Church in the particular church which, however, he can term simply a 'part' of the totality:

Sancta ecclesia, et in omnibus sit una, et in singulis tota.

Spiritus qui est procul dubio et unus et multiplex....
dat ecclesiae sanctae quam replet ut et in universitate sit una, et in suis partibus tota....⁷⁵

And in the modern period Joseph Ratzinger has spoken of the

local church as a living cell in which

the whole vital mystery of the one Body of the Church is present; each one is open on all sides through the same bonds of communion and preserves her existence as Church only through this openness.⁷⁶

There is, then, a circumincessio between the one Church and the many churches. But of what nature is this circumincession? The very word rules out any purely extrinsicist notion of the particular-in-the-universal (and vice versa), an extrinsicism most clearly presented, perhaps, in a 'federal' view of the Church's unity.⁷⁷

The Catholica is one, not as a summation of numerous particular churches, but because each particular church is a form in which the one Church occurs. The Church's unity is, in patristic language, 'mystical' or again, in the language of the nineteenth century Tübingen school, 'organic'. Afanasev's intention is to do justice to both poles. Yet he has not brought out as fully as might be the twin dimensions of particularity and universality implicit in his crucial instances of ecclesiality, the eucharistic assembly and its president, the bishop.⁷⁸

The Eucharist is necessarily at one and the same time a celebration of both the local church and the whole Church. The early Latin sacramentaries are good witnesses to its mutual ecclesial inclusiveness in this sense. Thus it has been said of the Gelasian Sacramentary:

Parfois le mot (ecclesia) désigne l'assemblée locale, parfois la totalité ou l'universalité des fidèles; le plus souvent on ne peut discerner s'il s'agit de l'une ou de l'autre et l'expression englobe les deux.⁷⁹

An ecclesiology which is not so much too narrowly as too

incompletely eucharistic will tend to privilege the dimension of the particular church at the expense of the dimension of the single Church which both indwells the local church and yet which the local church helps to constitute. The Eucharist is never just local: it always realises a universal relationship. The problem may be identified more closely by looking at the nature of the episcopate, as the paradigmatic form of the apostolic ministry in both Orthodox and Catholic traditions. For Afanasev it is important that, when the proēstos of a local church is made such, the presidents of other local churches should take part. In so doing, in 'co-consecrating', they attest the place of the local church they are visiting in the communion of the churches. They bear witness to the fact that in its life and faith this local church now receiving its bishop is one with the whole Church of God. But is it simply attestation which is at issue here? Is it not also realisation? The episcopal order, as a reflection of the ministerial unity of the apostles, is itself necessarily one. Whatever the method by which he is chosen, the person becoming a bishop does so only by admission to the undivided body of the episcopate at large. This is the decisive reason why the action of several bishops has always been required for his consecration. An ancient ruling, sanctioned at Nicaea, requires at least three co-consecrators, but even then all the bishops of the province must concur, those who are prevented from attending sending their written consent. In the African tradition, the symbolic number of twelve ordinatores was demanded.⁸⁰ The unity of the hierarchy, as Dom Adrien Gréa has insisted, 'fait de l'Eglise particulière une même chose avec l'Eglise universelle'.⁸¹ If this is so,

it follows necessarily that when the Eucharist is celebrated by the people around the person of their bishop, it is not merely the unity of the local church which is realised: rather, the Liturgy achieves the unity of this people in this place with this bishop, and of their unity with all those who in other places around other bishops, participate in the same mystery.

The bishop 'n'est pas d'abord le représentant de toute l'Eglise, ou le représentant de son Eglise: il est leur lien et leur médiation'.⁸² The Prima Clementis, and the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, show us the proēstos of a local church in just such a light, seeking to foster unanimity, homonoia, among all.⁸³

The bishop's responsibility embraces at one and the same time, presidency over his own church and active concern for the churches of others. The bishop belongs with his fellows in a single collegium, to use the term found in Cyprian, pope Celestine I and the Latin liturgical texts.⁸⁴

In the realm of the teaching of Christian doctrine, the notion of the episcopal college as the inheritor of the charism of the apostolic college is peculiarly important. The simple fact that each proēstos teaches in his own church the same faith as the other proēstotes teach in theirs is what is known in more modern Catholic parlance as the 'ordinary magisterium'. Since the teaching of one local bishop is not necessarily authentic Christian teaching, and since the mere sum of such teaching activity in the episcopate at large would not in itself guarantee authenticity, how is it that the tradition, as early as Irenaeus, has seen the episcopate as endowed with a charisma veritatis certum inherited from the apostles?⁸⁵ Only because as

a college, altogether, they possess what they could not have singly or simply in sum. A similar situation ^{ob.} pertains when the 'extraordinary magisterium' is under consideration: an ecumenical council is simply the college acting in an extraordinary way through the convocation of its members in one place. Thus in the realm of teaching, we come back to the same principle as that we have seen functioning in sacramental life (the consecration of a bishop) and in pastoral action (Clement, Ignatius): the bishop, by the very fact of being a bishop, is involved in responsibility for all the churches, that is, for the whole Church. De Lubac has assembled a dossier of texts from tradition to support this thesis but two may suffice to represent the witness of ancient and modern times. Origen's seventh homily In Jesu Nave includes a reprimand to bishops:

Quid hoc ad me spectat si alius male agit?... Tale ergo est quod agunt ii qui Ecclesiis praesunt, non cogitantes quia unum corpus sumus omnes qui credimus, unum Deum habentes, qui nos in unitate constringit et continet, Christum.⁸⁸

In similar vein, a pastoral letter of bishop Félix Dupanloup (1802-78), inquires:

Qui donc pourrait avoir une opinion aussi basse et aussi indigne de l'Église et de l'épiscopat catholique que de croire que tout souci, toute sollicitude doivent être relégués dans les limites étroites de chaque diocèse?⁸⁷

In the centuries that span these two texts, an incalculable number of acts inspired by the principle of 'collegiality', by affectus collegialis, must assuredly have taken place.

It is difficult to think that this mutual inclusion of particularity and universality, for which the tasks of the bishop are a mirror, has been adequately expressed in Afanasev's

writing. There are two points at which his privileging of the dimension of particularity leads to an imbalance. Firstly, there is his conviction, expressed most clearly in his discussion of the office of prophet in the Didache, that no Christian minister can have authority beyond the bounds of his own local church unless that local church specifically confides an additional mission beyond its bounds to him personally - and unless, reciprocally, another local church accept him. But we have seen that the mutual inclusion of particular church and whole Church, expressed sacramentally in the ordo episcopalis entails that one church, through its bishop, will, because of its very nature, have solicitude for all. Yet in fairness to Afanasev, he is careful to say, *à propos* of the Didache, that he does not deny the possibility that in the case of a minister working across the boundaries of local churches, the role of the local church from which he began his ministry may be reduced to very little. He simply insists that it can never be nil. In other words, there must be some continuing element of mandate from the local church whereby the man acts as he does. In the case of the episcopate, some local church must play its part in the ordaining of a believer to that office, even though when the ordination is complete, and the man enters the ordo of bishops, he has, by that very fact, an orientation to a wider concern than that of one local church. It appears from liturgical texts that episcopal consecration does require some participation of the faithful and presbyterate of a given church, as Afanasev's use of the ordination rites of Hippolytus makes clear. Yet the limitations of Afanasev's presentation of Eucharist and bishop are revealed by contrast in a 'common statement' signed by both

Orthodox and Catholics in 1977. The Chambésy declaration on ministry opens in a recognisably Afanasevan way:

Puisqu'il culmine dans la célébration de l'Eucharistie par laquelle tous deviennent un seul corps du Christ, le ministère de l'évêque est, au sein de l'ensemble des charismes et des ministères que l'Esprit suscite dans l'Eglise, un ministère de rassemblement dans l'unité. Dotée de la variété des dons de l'Esprit, la communauté locale porte en son centre, comme signe responsable de la communion de tous, l'évêque récapitulant sa plénitude.

But the text goes on:

Cette unité de l'Eglise locale est inséparable de la communion universelle des Eglises. Il est essentiel à une Eglise d'être en communion avec toutes. Cette communion s'exprime et se réalise dans et par le collège épiscopal. Par son ordination, l'évêque est constitué ministre d'une Eglise qu'il représente dans la communion universelle; il entre alors dans le collège des évêques. L'ordination épiscopale, faite au moins par trois évêques, exprime la communion des Eglises de ces évêques consécrateurs avec celle du nouvel ordonné: elle agrège celui-ci au collège des évêques.⁸⁸

Secondly, Afanasev characterises the relationship between two or more local churches qua expressions of the one Church of God as a matter of 'witnessing', or bearing testimony, together with its correlative, the reception of witness, or the accepting of testimony. The concept of witness has, manifestly, deep biblical roots, and soteriologically carries much fuller implications than our present-day forensic use of the term would imply.⁸⁹ But it may be doubted whether, even against the scriptural background, the concept of witness can bear the weight Afanasev is asking it to carry. Yet perhaps a distinction can be made. The relationship conjoining two

churches within the Catholica is certainly for Afanasev of an ontologically gracious kind. The Church after all is for him 'the Church of the Holy Spirit', for into the multitude of churches the same Spirit breathes a single life. Where there is a lack of 'mutual interiority' is for him in the very places where he seeks the unity of the local church: the Eucharist and the bishop, and where others see, more conformably to tradition, the mysteries which open the local church to other churches in the Church universal. But granted the need to correct here a too narrow or incomplete eucharistic ecclesiology, it may still be said that at the level of action and practice, the centrality given by Afanasev to the notion of witnessing is justified. He is asking that when we come to describe and prescribe for the empirical relations of the churches, not the secret action of the Spirit, nor the sacramental structures that flow from it but what may be called their public business one with another, we should adopt the model of martyria (witnessing), and not the model of exousia (authority) or of nomos (law). The reason for so doing would be that the category of witness has a greater fittingness to the theological realities concerned. The fundamental ontological equality of the local churches, and their common life as a life of charity lived in relation to the triune God expressed in incarnation and atonement: these considerations should make us shun any model of relationship which suggests domination or constraint.

The very great ecumenical importance of the relation between particular church and Church universal is becoming ever more apparent. Ratzinger, in a critique of the Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, found

it necessary to insist that

The universal Church is not a mere external amplification, contributing nothing to the essential nature of Church in the local churches, but it extends into that very nature itself.⁹⁰

But it may be noted, with Père Jean Tillard, O.P., that if certain basic qualities of particularity and universality are safeguarded there is room here for two complementary perspectives. Tillard is clear that particularity and universality, churches and Church, may not be set against one another. For him, the New Testament concept of koinōnia already sets a quite proper barrier against such a prospect. For this word, which signifies both the pneumatological dimension of the Church - the 'togetherness' of the disciples produced by the Holy Spirit, and her christological dimension - the radical unity resulting from the common partaking of the life in Christ, is realised not only in the local Christian communities but also in the communion of these communities with one another. Nevertheless, as he writes:

This relationship between the universal and the local, a relationship which is an indispensable and integral aspect of catholicity, can be interpreted in two ways both of which ... are acceptable and neither of which excludes the other.⁹¹

Either one can give a formal priority to the concept of the Church universal, or one can give it to the church in particular. The first of these two perspectives has its full justification in the account of Pentecost in the Book of the Acts, where a single faith and life, born of the Spirit, are evidently meant to encompass all languages and cultures and so, we can say without too much straining of the Lucan text, all particular churches. This approach will lay the main stress on the elements in the

Church's tradition which guard the principle of universality: letters of communion, the collegial symbolism at the ordination of a bishop, conciliarity, the unity of the episcopal college safeguarded by its communion with the bishop of Rome. Here various 'particularities' are seen as the explication, unfolded over time and across space, of the richness of a primordial unity. The second perspective, giving priority to the concept of the church-in-particular is also justified on traditional grounds. Here one may quote in illustration a paragraph of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of the Second Vatican Council:

*Haec Christi Ecclesia vere adest in omnibus legitimis fidelium congregationibus localibus, quae, pastoribus suis adhaerentes, et ipsae in Novo Testamento ecclesiae vocantur. Hae sunt enim loco suo Populus novus a Deo vocatus, in Spiritu Sancto et in plenitudine multa. In eis praedicatione Evangelii Christi congregantur fideles et celebratur mysterium Coenae Domini, ut per escam et sanguinem Domini corporis fraternitatis cuncta copuletur. In quavis altaris communitate, sub Episcopi sacro ministerio, exhibetur symbolum illius caritatis et unitatis Corporis mystici, sine qua non potest esse salus. In his communitatibus, licet saepe exiguis et pauperibus, vel in dispersione degentibus, praesens est Christus, cuius virtute consociatur una, sancta, catholica et apostolica Ecclesia. Etenim non aliud agit participatio corporis et sanguinis Christi, quam in id quod sumimus transeamus.*⁹²

In this perspective, it is the bishop's responsibility to ensure that in the celebration of the Eucharist his church acts in such a way that the other churches are therein able to recognise their own fulness of identity; at the same time, in its turn, his church must be able to recognise its own essential features in the others and its true identity with them. Thus, since each

bishop must ensure that the local communion is distinctively Christian, he has to make it aware of the universal communion of which it is part.

The two perspectives thus meet; they may indeed be called complementary. Thus, in an attempt to bring out the meaning of ekklēsia in the New Testament, Hamer writes: 'Le mot "Église" désigne le peuple de Dieu dans sa totalité et la manifestation de ce peuple en un lieu particulier'.⁹³

Nevertheless, by pressing one of them to its logical conclusion it is possible to reach results which would not be found at all were the same rough treatment applied to the other. But this is a familiar epistemological topos. The idea of complementarity was introduced by Nils Bohr at the International Congress of Physics at Como in 1927. As a natural scientist, Bohr had made a major contribution towards understanding the atom. The basic elements of matter had been classified under two distinct categories, waves and particles. In 1905 Einstein questioned whether light should be interpreted solely in terms of waves. In 1924, L. de Broglie showed that a wave is associated with every particle, and vice versa. Electrons, a classic particle type, display the characteristics of waves, yet particles and wave are concepts which cannot be reduced to each other. The electron, then, has two irreconcilable aspects which must be invoked in turn in order to explain all its properties.

These are like the faces of an object that one cannot contemplate all at once in its entirety but which have to be envisaged in turn if the object is to be described completely. Bohr calls these two aspects 'complementary' aspects; understanding by this that these aspects are on the one hand contradictory and on the other complementary.⁹⁴

Bohr himself generalised from his notion of complementarity, turning it into an epistemological principle which could be applied to a wide diversity of subject matters. Yves Congar has warned against the danger of exploiting this concept too facilely, yet goes on:

My study of the procession of the Holy Spirit in the Greek fathers on the one hand and in the Latin tradition on the other has led me to recognise that there are two constructions of the mystery, each of which is coherent and complete - although each is unsatisfactory on some point - and which cannot be superimposed. It is a case for applying Bohr's saying, 'the opposite of a true statement is a false statement, but the opposite of a profound truth can be another profound truth'.⁹⁵

Taking up this hint, some further thoughts may be offered here on the relation between particularist and universalist ecclesiologies as two perspectives not reducible to each other. For the former the whole Church is present in one local church; for the latter the whole Church is only present in the totality of the local churches. To this may be compared, following Afanasev's cue in 'Dve idei vselenskoï Tserkvi', the mystery of the Trinity. From the viewpoint of the divine nature, the divinity is fully present in the being and action of one divine Person. From the viewpoint, however, of the consubstantial personal communion, the divinity is only found in all three. It is not possible to subsume this contrast under some more inclusive category. So it is with the Church. In particularist ecclesiology, the whole Church is present in a particular church; in universalist ecclesiology, however, the whole Church is present only in the integration of all the particular churches. If one thinks the universal Church from the side

of a particularist ecclesiology, one has the idea of the communion of churches. Through participation in this communion, the particular churches express or 'focus' the being of the entire church. If, however, one thinks the particular church from the side of a universalist ecclesiology, one gets the idea of the local church as portio populi Dei, existing through incorporation into the Church universal. As in trinitarian theology neither perspective can be suppressed, so in ecclesiology. Yet in a given period, there may be a need to express one more firmly in order to restore a balance between them. But this should not be done in such a way as to create fresh imbalance. For some statements may fit only awkwardly into one or other perspective, and yet be required by Christian faith in the mystery of the Church.

These complementary universalist and particularist ecclesiologies can already be seen at work in the New Testament. Jean Colson has interpreted in this fashion the structural differences between a Pauline and a Johannine tradition in ecclesiology. Paul sees the Church as the body of Christ, a people dispersed in communities throughout the world of which Christ is the head.

La tradition paulinienne était dans la perspective du mystère de la rédemption universelle. Un seul étant mort pour tous, il fallait que le monde prenne conscience de son unité dans le Christ, l'unique Chef de l'humanité rachetée, et que cède tout particularisme local.⁹⁶

Hence on the one hand there were 'acephalous' communities with colleges of presbyters, whose ultimate unity was assured by

Paul in person: bearing 'the care of all the churches' he exhorted and reprimanded. Hence too the essentially Pauline concern for liaison between all the churches, and to ensure this in practice and to avoid closed societies the itinerant ministry of apostolic delegates. This Pauline perspective recurs, Colson suggests, in Clement of Rome and the Pastor Hermae, where we find such acephalous government of communities under their presbyteral senate. Since these are Roman writings, it is perhaps understandable that, when the apostles disappeared from the scene, it was the Western churches which became most rapidly aware of the primacy of the apostolic church of Rome, where Peter and Paul died. This became their unifying factor. By contrast, turning to the Johannine tradition as represented in the 'letters to the churches' of the Apocalypse, Colson finds that, in the earthly sphere, these churches are personified by their 'angels', that is, their bishops.

Pour Jean, au contraire, l'unité d'une Église s'incarne dans son 'ange'. La communauté est tout entière résumée en lui. Il est l'image de sa vivante unité. Il y a là, sous-jacente, une 'mystique' de l'Incarnation chère à toute la littérature johannique'.⁹⁷

By way of conclusion we can note here the need to modify at some point Afanasev's account of the relation between the One and the Many in the Church, while at the same time admitting the fundamental truth of his notion that, qualitatively or intensively, the local church, since it is the church of the bishop's Eucharist, manifests the mystery of the Church in its fulness. Such modification might be carried out in one or both of two ways. Either, it might be shown that the particularist

perspective must remain open to complementation by the universalist perspective, which also has a grounding in Scripture and Tradition. Here the same reality would enable and require description in ways not themselves combinable, as in the complementarity principle of Bohr. Alternatively or additionally, the concepts of Eucharist and episcopate could be further explored to bring out those aspects of their own intrinsic being which prompt appeal beyond the local church: the conditions on which the local Eucharist and bishop are 'authentic' are not simply to be found within the particular church. What is in question here, fundamentally, is the institutions of Council and Papacy. The next two sections will be concerned with each of these in turn.

III. Council and reception

Afanasev's ecclesiology is deeply influenced by his early studies in the history of the Councils. His turn towards an ecclesiology which was essentially a theology of the local church cannot be severed from the somewhat negative view of the conciliar institution engendered by his Belgrade researches. For if the conciliar institution be regarded as a largely extraneous presence within Christianity, then, for an Orthodox who by definition rejects that other universalising institution, the Papacy, the régime of life of the churches becomes one of mutual, rather than common, witnessing to the faith. While it is desirable, on this view, for one local church to comment on the life and faith of another, it is not incumbent on local churches to determine corporately their life and faith through

the conciliar assembly of the episcopate. Councils may meet, and take juridically binding decisions when they do. But these determinations carry no strictly ecclesial authority until received by the local churches which are the true loci of grace and truth. The thesis that the borrowing of institutional forms from the Roman imperial administration might distort or even eviscerate the Church's substance is one that could occur to any historian of the patristic period. But its verification turns on a theological question. Were there perhaps elements in the Church of New Testament and sub-apostolic times that were actualised in a new way by these developments? Are we observing the importation of a foreign factor, or do the loan elements serve to re-express in a novel institutional form something already present in the Church's life? Is there, in the period which precedes the emergence of the conciliar institution, a more general concept of collegiality which could subsequently be re-formulated in a concept of conciliarity?

Several considerations suggest a more positive reply to these questions than Afanasev's somewhat ambivalent attitude. Firstly, there is the New Testament conviction that the Church rests on the apostles and as such is a single Church. The gospel tradition is unanimous in presenting the Twelve as envoys of Jesus. More especially, the Fourth Gospel contains the Last Supper prayer of Jesus for the unity of the Twelve, notably in the allegory of the Vine, as well as references to their common receiving of the Spirit of truth in view of which they share a mission to the world.⁹⁸ In the Acts of the Apostles, we have the witness of an early Christian writer to the function of the Twelve within the primitive community.

The group undertakes corporately the co-option of a new member to replace Judas Iscariot, and it is to this body that the Holy Spirit is given.⁹⁹

Pour l'auteur des Actes, il est clair que c'est là la première image de l'Eglise: le collège des Douze, avec Pierre à leur tête, inspiré par l'Esprit-Saint et baptisant une foule de trois milles hommes, de toutes les nations qui sont sur la terre.¹⁰⁰

It is, once again, in common that the Twelve institute the Seven as their assistants. Particularly noteworthy is the manner in which the apostolic group resolves the first great crisis to engulf the early Church: that of the status of the Mosaic Law within the new Christian dispensation. Though it may be excessive to call the assembly described in Acts 15 a council, it is nonetheless clear that the most important decision affecting the Church's mission in the apostolic age was taken by a gathering of the apostles - even though this decision did not concern directly the (purely Jewish-Christian) church of Jerusalem in whose immediate context it was made.¹⁰¹ In the case of the Pauline letters, even in the most polemical passage of Galatians against the 'pillars' of the Jerusalem church, Paul shows a marked desire to obtain a unity of thought and action with Peter, James and John. The Pauline vision of the Church is that of an organised unity within which the apostles hold the first place.¹⁰² Similarly, in the Johannine Apocalypse, the Church is imaged as a house built on the apostles, the proleptic realisation of the heavenly assembly.¹⁰³ In the New Testament witness, the Church's foundation is provided collegially by the apostles.

Secondly, in the sub-apostolic period, we find Church officers conscious of a corporate responsibility for the guarding of the apostolic tradition. The problem of who is to guard the parathēkē, 'deposit', had already arisen in the Pastoral Epistles. There Timothy appears as the delegate of an apostle, mandated to guard the deposit and also to select presbyter-bishops who will preside over their respective communities.¹⁰⁴ Though it is not alleged in the Pastorals that these presbyter-bishops will inherit the authority of 'apostolic men' over the deposit, and so, presumably, the corporate or collegial mode of acting of the apostles in matters touching the community, such a development soon appears in the sub-apostolic period. In the First Letter of Clement, we find an indirect apostolic succession: the first heads of the churches being installed by the apostles, and the former, rather than the latter, instituting that subsequent ministerial succession which is the episcopate.¹⁰⁵ Although in Ignatius of Antioch a collegial conception of Church leadership appears to have become absorbed into an episcopal congregationalism it may be that Ignatius simply had no call to deal with issues beyond the scope of the local church and bishop to determine. A very different picture is offered during the Paschal crisis, where we find Polycarp of Smyrna travelling to Rome in order to expound the tradition of the Asian churches to the Roman bishop.¹⁰⁶ Here we have an instance of a bishop conscious of himself as an accredited interpreter of the apostolic tradition yet also aware that he has a duty to consult other hierarchs similarly placed. Moreover, such expressions of the bonds of communion are surely necessary to account for the doctrinal consensus which,

in the mid second century, Hegesippus ascribed to the universal episcopate as he had encountered it.¹⁰⁷ The same hypothesis of episcopal consultation would account for the ease with which the Great Church raised a common front against Gnosticism. While to the pure historian the Great Church, as defined by the doctrinal solidarity of the historic episcopate, is simply one form of Christianity among others such as Marcionism and Montanism, to the theological student aware of the New Testament background the Great Church so conceived is operating on principles already present in Christian origins. On this view, it is reasonable to regard the impulse which impelled bishops to travel out on the roads of the empire as the same which later led them to gather in synods: corporate responsibility for the apostolic deposit.

Thirdly, Afanasev does not seem to have pondered sufficiently the fact of the holding of pre-Constantinian councils. The conciliar institution dates from the last quarter of the second century.¹⁰⁸ A number of factors explain its emergence at this point. Firstly, there is the elaboration of a full-blooded doctrine of apostolic succession, drawing with it the notion that a council of bishops might represent the college of apostles. In Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Cyprian, we find a growing sense that the bishops of local churches constitute an ordo episcoporum, responsible in common for the flock of Christ.¹⁰⁹ Secondly, around 175 a new type of intellectual question emerged which could not be coped with by a simple appeal to the regula fidei as that had taken shape in the baptismal creeds of the early second century churches.

Les premières questions qui se sont posées à l'Eglise

venaient surtout des ennemies de l'extérieur, le marcionisme et les divers gnosticismes, qui falsifiaient complètement l'Evangile. Il suffisait pour les réfuter d'en appeler aux données élémentaires du message chrétien, qui allait se concrétiser dans le Credo très simple de la Règle de Foi, court résumé de la Révélation.¹¹⁰

Subsequently, it was not a question of juxtaposing the rule of faith with frankly anti-Christian deviations, but of treating both disciplinary questions and doctrinal matters raised by those who, in principle, accepted that rule; notably, the Paschal question, the problem of the lapsi and Novatianism, the baptism of heretics and the Trinitarian theology and Christology of Paul of Samosata. The first of these new issues was Montanism: the movement to which Afanasev ascribed the Didache with its 'universal' ecclesiology was in fact a principal means whereby the conciliar institution emerged as the chief common body of the universal Church. Finally, the process of evangelisation had reached sufficiently far by this period for there to be local churches in a wide variety of areas. Without a certain geographical growth, it hardly makes sense to speak of the possibility of a universal council.

Although the Montanist crisis is the occasion of the first known church council, a regional council of the churches of Asia Minor, a more important move towards the idea of a universal council was the series of simultaneous regional councils held around 190 in Italy, Asia Minor, Palestine and Mesopotamia in order to resolve the Paschal question, the problem of the dating of Easter. The same format was used by the episcopate for dealing with the issue of the lapsi: what to do about Christians who had apostatised temporarily

under threat of persecution. But this time, in the 250's, there was a further development. Official letters describing conciliar decisions and dubbed 'synodal letters' were sent to any local churches not represented at these councils, appealing for their adherence. The reception of synodal letters throughout the whole Church from councils representing parts of the Church was the next and greatest step of the ante-Nicene period towards the concept of a universal council. By the 260's we may say that the idea of ecumenicity or universal decision-making theological authority has at last emerged. The reception by the universal episcopate of a council's teaching is seen as giving that teaching a definitive status as an expression of the Church's tradition. Summarising this process, Gustave Bardy commented:

Les évêques veulent que la possibilité leur soit donnée de se concerter afin de fournir des solutions capables d'être acceptées partout. Rien ne serait plus dangereux en pareille matière que d'agir en ordre dispersé et de donner aux étrangers l'impression que l'unité de l'Eglise serait un vain mot. Une fois assemblées, ils prendront de commun accord les décisions qui leur sembleront les meilleures.¹¹¹

The 264 council convened to consider the orthodoxy of the Antiochene bishop Paul of Samosata is, together with its sequel in 268, a remarkable anticipation of the general lines of the seven ecumenical councils to follow. The synodal letter of the 268 council was addressed to the two most important absentees, Denis of Rome and Maximus of Alexandria, but also to bishops 'throughout the world', kata tēn oikoumenēn,¹¹² Bardy states explicitly that this gathering was 'le modèle du concile de Nicée', citing in his study, Paul de Samosate,

the affirmation of Alexander of Alexandria that Paul had been condemned by a 'council', sunodos, and 'judgment', krisis, of bishops from everywhere.¹¹³ The 314 council of Ancyra, held under the auspices of the Antiochene church, proceeded by episcopal initiative alone, being convened on the eve of the Edict of Milan. In the same year, Constantine assembled at Arles a Western council in which the initiative was entirely his. Despite the disparity in convocation, the fundamental characters of these two councils is much the same. With regard to the first ecumenical council, Nicaea I, it is interesting that while Eusebius ascribes the conciliar initiative to Constantine, Rufinus adds that the convocation was ex sacerdotum sententia.¹¹⁴ Contemporary churchmen held that since the Arian crisis concerned the whole Church it should be dealt with by the bishops of the whole. Noteworthy here is the synodal letter of the exactly contemporary council of Antioch (late 324) which exhibits a sense that there is but one Church, a body whose members are spread through the oikoumenē, which must act as one in major matters. In this text we find that use of Paul's metaphor of the Church as body which Afanasev regards as Cyprianic abuse: namely, the notion that the local churches (and not just individuals) are members.

Since there is only one body of the Catholic Church (spread) through every place, even if the dwellings where it assembles are in different places, as members of the whole body, it follows that we are making known to your Charity what has been discussed and done with common accord by our holy brothers, our colleagues, so that you too, being present in spirit, may speak in common with us also, regarding what we have wisely decided and done according to the canons of the Church.¹¹⁵

These ante-Nicene councils were marked by features prophetic of the ecumenical councils themselves. The effort was made to obtain the concourse of as many bishops as possible, and, once assembled, these men strove after unanimity in conciliar decision-making.¹¹⁶ The ecclesiological implications have been spelled out by Hilaire Marot in terms of a dual axis of particularity and universality, reminiscent of that 'circumincession' of the one and the many noted in the last section.

Cette ecclésiologie de communion a pour base l'Eglise locale. Cette cellule initiale est fondée sur l'évêque, successeur des apôtres et qui, tenant sa charge de Dieu, incarne visiblement l'autorité (L'Eglise dans l'évêque) et, élu par la communauté, demeure en union étroite avec cette dernière (l'évêque dans l'Eglise). L'ensemble de ces Eglises locales forme l'Eglise universelle. Celle-ci, malgré sa dispersion dans l'espace, a pour caractère fondamentale et spécifique l'unité.... C'est donc sur l'ensemble des évêques, chefs des Eglises locales, qu'est à son tour établie l'Eglise catholique. Les évêques, qui ne sont pas des individus isolés et dont les Eglises sont en communion, forment un collège, et ce collège est un, comme l'Eglise elle-même. Parce que l'épiscopat est indivis, et que chaque Eglise, dans la mesure où elle communie au tout, est un microcosme de l'Eglise totale, les évêques sont responsables en commun de la doctrine, de la discipline et enfin de l'unité de l'Eglise. L'Eglise anténicéenne en a un sentiment très vif....

Marot concludes his account of this synodal activity by casting doubt on the notion that the ante-Nicene councils were merely regional, such that only with the advent of the Christian empire, and the concomitant introduction of a juridical regimen for the Church, did the idea of ecumenicity in councils appear. He proposes instead that 'la rupture avec le passé fut en

réalité moins considérable'.¹¹⁷ The difference made to the conciliar institution by the advent of the Christian empire seems to be mainly improved practical possibilities in assembling the bishops, together with an intensifying of the sense of the single oikoumenē.¹¹⁸

Nevertheless, Afanasev has placed his finger on features of the early ecumenical councils which are prima facie disturbing. These features may be considered under the heading of convocation and composition. On the first, how is it possible to reconcile a theological ascription of the council to the inter-relationships of the bishops (and so their churches) with a frank acknowledgement that, from the empirical standpoint, the ecumenical councils resulted from an imperial initiative? Is not this an attempt to have one's cake and eat it? Curiously, just such a combination of ideas occurs in the Contra Parmenianum of Optatus of Milevis. Writing around 370, Optatus has this to say of the origins of the council of Arles:

Communi copulo caritatis et unitate matris ecclesiae
catholicae vinculo inhaerentes, ad Arelatensium civitatem
piissimi imperatoris voluntate adducenti....¹¹⁹

Here it is the will of the emperor which convokes the bishops, yet they can only be convoked because they are already attached to each other through the bonds of charity and the unity of Mother Church. Moreover, Afanasev fails to note that contemporary sources occasionally present the Roman church as formally acquiescing in imperial acts of convocation. Thus Leo the Great writes to Marcian about the calling of Chalcedon that, since the emperor deemed it necessary, he would not oppose it: non renitor. Later, the pope would describe the council as

convoked by the emperor with the consent of the apostolic see.¹²⁰ These two considerations qualify Afanasev's conclusion that strictly ecclesial factors played no vital part in the calling of the ecumenical assemblies.

Similar qualifications should be made to Afanasev's complementary belief that numerical considerations played no serious part in the definition of an ecumenical council. It may be doubted whether the imperial will was thought of as deciding absoluter what should count as ecumenicity of composition. To begin with, there was a widespread assumption that, so far as was possible, a council should include representatives of the whole inhabited world. Admittedly, the word oikoumenē is ambiguous, for it may mean, not the inhabited earth, but the empire destined, according to the imperial ideology, one day to possess that earth. But other formulae in use suggest the former, more genuinely universal, denotation, as in Athanasius' address to the bishops of Egypt and Libya where he speaks of hoi synelthontes pantes pantachōthen episkopoi.¹²¹ It is perhaps owing to this ambiguity that some contemporary commentators, such as Sozomen, stress the presence at the councils of the bishops of the apostolic sees.¹²² This was a factor which did not depend on the structure of the empire or the policies of its chief functionary. It was this concept which produced the claim that a fully ecumenical council must be attended, whether directly or indirectly, by the holders of the five patriarchal sees deemed to be (in the case of Constantinople with greater or less assurance) apostolic. Beginning with the Third Council of Constantinople in 680-1 this becomes a regular condition of full ecumenicity, for instance in

Maximus the Confessor, Theodore of Studion, and John of Damascus, and is taken up at Nicaea II.¹²³ Constantinople IV, the anti-Photian synod of 869, was deemed ecumenical both by the representative of the Jerusalem patriarch and by Anastasius the Librarian who represented Nicholas I, on the grounds that all five patriarchs were represented there.¹²⁴ Such ideas enjoyed a certain favour in the Latin Church of the Middle Ages, being supported by Nicholas of Cusa.¹²⁵ For John of Turrecremata, there was a two-tier ecumenicity, whereby councils where all five were present or represented possessed plenary ecumenicity, even though those which the Roman patriarch attended or convened carried an adequate ecumenicity, given the implicit universality of the head of the episcopal college.¹²⁶ Naturally, the stress on five would today be anachronistic. As Congar has remarked, 'Son sens ecclésiologique peut être gardé, mais le critère des cinq ne peut, comme tel, résister aux faits'.¹²⁷

Afanasev rightly points out that the councils did not include anything like all the bishops: not even of the Church of the empire. Chalcedon was the best attended of the councils of antiquity, but its five hundred bishops were less numerous than those of the province of Africa alone in the period. This consideration has led some to speak of the 'moral' quality of ecumenicity: the bishops present intended to represent the whole Church.

Si peu nombreux qu'ils puissent être en fait, les évêques rassemblés entendent bien représenter toute l'Eglise: nous parlerions d'universalité morale ou spirituelle.¹²⁸

Yet such subjective intention must surely have some objective correlate. The degree to which all significant traditions

within the patristic church were represented at the ecumenical councils is, unfortunately, not very great. The Latin presence was notoriously feeble. Two extenuating features can be noted. Firstly, Latin theology might be influential even when its bearers were numerically weak: thus while at Chalcedon the Latin West was formally represented by three Roman legates and two African bishops possibly there by chance, since they were refugees from the Vandal invasions, the role of the Tome of Leo at the Council was considerably in excess of what this might suggest.¹²⁹

Secondly, there was a custom of holding at Rome a more limited Western council before the opening of the ecumenical council itself. To this degree, those few Western churchmen who shared in the ecumenical councils could be seen as spokesmen of a much wider consensus.¹³⁰

In moving on to consider the related issue of reception we may note, by way of conclusion to a discussion of the conciliar principle, Wilhelm de Vries' judgment that the ecumenical councils did not, at any rate, think of themselves as Reichskirchlich institutions whose true authority lay in the act of their reception:

Die Ökumenische Konzile verstehen sich selbst als die Vertreter der universalen Kirche, die in deren Namen und Autorität als authentische Zeugen des Glaubens die Tradition und den Glauben der ganzen Kirche für jedermann verbindlich auslegen und verkünden. Der Gedanke, dass erst die spätere Rezeption durch die Gesamtkirche den Konzilsbeschlüsse ihre Autorität verleiht, liegt diesen Konzilen fern. Tatsächlich ist diese Rezeption aber für die effektive Geltung der Konzilsbeschlüsse von Bedeutung gewesen.¹³¹

It is true that, within the patristic period itself, the authority ascribed to councils was frequently the material authority of the doctrine taught by them, recognised as

continuous with that of Scripture and fathers.¹³² On the other hand, this did not render appeal to formal authority superfluous. Afanasev tends to discount such evidence because he holds that, while the Councils may have been providentially utilised, an institution with such manifestly post-apostolic roots cannot be of the esse of the Church, and so cannot be regarded as a possible plenary actualisation of the Church's nature. Certainly, a theological explanation is required here. It can only be found in an account of the Council as actualisation of some more fundamental conciliarity of the Church as such.¹³³ In the documents of the Second Vatican Council it is proposed that the episcopate constitutes a permanent college in such a way that its own collegiality may be exercised at discreet moments of various types.¹³⁴ But neither the apostolic college nor its ministerial successor college operated without a relation to the wider community of disciples.

Cette communauté est même antérieure à l'institution des ministres; c'est en elle que ceux-ci sont choisis et institués, et leur ministère est tout relatif à la vie de foi, louange et charité de cette communauté. A cet égard, il faut voir la collégialité épiscopale, surtout telle qu'elle est exercée en concile, comme l'organe et, en même temps, l'expression de la conciliarité profonde de l'Eglise, comme l'organe et l'expression de la communion consubstantielle des Eglises particulières dans lesquelles 'est présente et agissante l'Eglise du Christ une, sainte, catholique et apostolique'.¹³⁵

The most ambitious attempt at an ecclesiology of the councils is, however, that of Hans Küng, who sees the ecumenical council by human convocation as a representation of the ecumenical council by divine convocation, namely, the Church itself. The Church is

'the great concilium of the faithful, convoked in the Spirit by God himself through Christ'.¹³⁶ The ecumenical council is a manifest ecumenical representation of the Church, taking 'representation' not in the sense of deputising, but of re-presenting. The concept of personification is original; that of delegation being a nuance added through the work of the decretalists who thus provided a major plank in the foundations of the conciliar theory.¹³⁷ But though the formula universalem Ecclesiam repraesentans used at Constance and Basle would awake in the timorous the fear of conciliarism, its fundamental justice was recognised at Trent, not least by the papal legates.¹³⁸ Küng concludes from his survey of this concept of the Council as Ecclesia coadunata:

All the individual churches, so different from one another, scattered throughout the oikoumene in all countries and continents, made up of all races, languages, and cultures, belonging to societies with different political and social structures, and having different rites, liturgies, theologies and forms of piety and law, by virtue of their assemblage constitute and realise the visible-invisible unity of the whole Church as a special concrete event: the representation of the one Church.¹³⁹

As the outstanding, truly ecumenical, representation of the Church, the Council stands under the special protection of the Holy Spirit promised the Church by the Johannine Christ.¹⁴⁰

This raises the issue of the respective roles of conciliar event and reception. The term 'reception' appears to have entered theology from the history of law. Legal historians, notably in Germany, used the word to denote the entry of Roman law into German ecclesiastical and civil society in the later

Middle Ages. Accordingly, A. Grillmeier has suggested that in theology 'reception' refers to a strictly exogenous process.¹⁴¹ Reception will not hold between realities that are internally related, such as the response of the universal Church to an ecumenical council. Rather, it will be used for the acceptance of particular synods by the universal Church, or, better still, of ecumenical councils by separated parts of the Church - as when, for instance, the Assyrian (Nestorian) church might, hypothetically, accept Ephesus. But Y. Congar, wishing to use the term for the process whereby the universal Church accepts universal Councils holds that Grillmeier's definition is far too narrow.

Certes, pour qu'il y ait réception, il faut toujours une certaine distance, une certaine altérité entre l'instance qui donne et l'instance qui reçoit. Mais si l'on demeure dans le cadre de l'Eglise une, sa nature ou son exigence profonde de communion empêche l'altérité d'être complète... Par 'réception' nous entendons ici le processus par lequel un corps ecclésial fait sienne en vérité une détermination qu'il ne s'est pas donnée à lui-même, en reconnaissant, dans la mesure promulguée, une règle qui convient à sa vie.¹⁴²

For in point of fact, reception in this wider sense has marked the history of the ecumenical councils. Nicaea was not fully received until Constantinople I. The latter was received when Chalcedon accepted its Creed as the fullest expression of the faith of Nicaea, though it was only in 519 that pope Hormisdas, in receiving the profession of faith of the patriarch John, recognised Constantinople I as the second of the four ecumenical councils held up to that date.¹⁴³ At Ephesus, Cyril arranged for the dogmatisation of the Theotochos teaching before the arrival of the Antiochene and Roman parties. Thus it was

not till two years afterwards, with the coming together of the Cyrilline group and that of John of Antioch, that the council realised the most elementary conditions of ecumenicity - a fact Newman appealed to in the wake of Vatican I. Against those who maintained that the opposition of the minority in 1869-70 removed the Council's claim to ecumenicity, Newman held that subsequent reception by the minority of the Council's teaching offered a complementation of its being. Again, while Chalcedon received the Tome of Leo and the two dogmatic letters of Cyril, its own teaching took a long time to be received in the East. For whereas in the West reception was summed up in the approval of the Roman bishop, in the East a much more complex process had to be inaugurated, including preaching, spirituality, liturgical expression and theological elaboration.¹⁴⁴ This raises the important question as to whether, in addition to the conciliar organ of ecclesial consciousness, there may not also be an organ for the ascertaining of ecclesial reception of councils. Nicaea II, indeed, declared that for a council to be ecumenical it must be received by the praesules ecclesiarum, and in the first place by the Roman pope. This should be distinguished, however, from the traditional claim in the Latin tradition, especially in its Ultramontane form, that no council can merit the name unless it has the consent of the apostolic Roman see, since it is from the authority and sanction of the first see that councils receive their force and consistency.¹⁴⁵ Yet theologians perfectly cognizant of this claim could still offer additional criteria of ecumenicity in terms of reception, for instance, Martin Perez de Ayala at Trent:

Est secunda via apprehendi veritatem in dubiis. Conciliorum

scilicet generalium omnium consensione populorum fidelium
receptam auctoritatem.¹⁴⁶

And in pope Gelasius, writing in 495, we find a combination of such factors: Gelasius proposes that a 'good' council is one which 'universalis Ecclesiae probavit assensus', and which the first see approves. A 'bad' council, on the other hand, is one which speaks:

contra Scripturas sanctas, contra doctrinam patrum, contra ecclesiasticas regulas, quam tota merito Ecclesia non recepit et praecipue sedes apostolica non probabit.

And Gelasius summarises his teaching by describing an authentic council as one conforming to Scripture and Tradition and which

cuncta recepit Ecclesia, quam maxime sedes apostolica comprobatur.¹⁴⁷

Moreover, many councils and documents of limited local scope have acquired a universal value because the Church has 'received' them in a fuller way: notably, in the West, through the action of the Roman see. As examples of what Grillmeier terms 'exogenous' reception, one might cite the Antiochene synod of 269 which condemned Paul of Samosata's Adoptionism, the anti-Pelagian council of Carthage in 418, the council of Orange of 529 on the subject of grace, utilised at Trent; the 675 council of Toledo with its Trinitarian teaching; the synods of 833 and 855 at Quiercy and Valence on predestination; the Quicumque vult. In the light of these three types of instance - general councils, local councils, texts in theological tradition, Congar proposes that a theology of the councils cannot rest content with a purely juridical concept of conciliar (and credal) authenticity.

Ce qui fait la valeur des conciles c'est qu'ils expriment la foi des Apôtres et des Pères, la Tradition de l'Eglise ... Les conciles ont exprimé l'apostolicité et la catholicité de l'Eglise, et cela parce qu'ils représentent la totalité de l'Eglise et ont réalisé un consensus.... Après Nicée, et en prenant sans cesse Nicée comme modèle, on a aimé souligner l'assurance que le Christ préside aux conciles et que le Saint-Esprit les assiste. Mais l'essentiel est de reconnaître en eux la foi des Apôtres transmise depuis eux par les Pères... C'est pourquoi aussi sans doute un concile dans l'antiquité, commençait par la lecture des décrets des conciles antérieures: il ne voulait être qu'une étape nouvelle dans la transmission mais c'était aussi un acte de réception. La théologie du concile nous apparaît liée à celle de l'apostolicité, dont elle est un aspect. De même que le plus décisif n'est pas la succession formelle, nuda successio, mais l'identité profonde du content et de la foi, encore que les deux doivent aller de pair, de même le plus décisif dans un concile n'est ni le nombre de ses participants, ni la correction juridique de sa procédure, mais le contenu de ses déterminations, encore que les deux doivent aller de pair.¹⁴⁸

Such an account must not be confused with the characteristically Slavophile position, found originally in A.S. Khomiakov, according to which councils possess no dogmatic authority in and of themselves. For Khomiakov, doctrinal authority belongs only to the truth itself and truth's only organ is the sense of the Christian community.¹⁴⁹ The list of Orthodox theologians who have accepted this thesis reaches from Bulgakov to bishop K.T. Ware, though it is not without its Orthodox critics.

Sie meinen, dass auf der juristischen Ebene kein formales Kriterium der Ökumenizität und der Unfehlbarkeit des Konzils existiert. Darüber entscheidet weder die kanonische Korrektheit des Konzils noch seine zahlenmäßige Repräsentation noch die Approbation

durch den Papst. Kein Konzil hat in sich selbst eine garantierte Autorität, es ist lediglich eine Widerspiegelung des Bewusstseins der Kirche, das die Gemeinschaft der Gläubigen als Ausdruck des Glaubens der gesamten Kirche anerkennt oder ablehnt.¹⁵⁰

Congar, by contrast, insists that reception cannot confer validity on conciliar acts: the notion of retrospective validation is frankly incoherent in this realm. But what cannot be conferred can be attested:

La réception n'est pas constitutive de la qualité juridique d'une décision. Elle porte non sur l'aspect formel de l'acte, mais sur son contenu. Elle ne confère pas la validité. Elle constate, reconnaît et atteste que cela répond au bien de l'Eglise, car elle concerne une décision (dogme, canons, règles éthiques) qui doit assurer le bien de l'Eglise.¹⁵¹

Such reception draws on the wider conciliarity of the Church. It conforms to that original reception of the Father's gift of his incarnate Son, in that it takes place in the Holy Spirit, that is in the Spirit-animated koinōnia. But this wider process of reception needs some ministerial organ to determine when it has run a sufficient course. As J. Zizioulas has written:

Reception cannot be limited to the local level but has to be universal. A ministry of universal reception is needed which should meet the requirements of communion. Such requirements would involve the following: (a) that this ministry should be episcopal in nature, i.e., it should be exercised by the head of a local church. This would ensure that universal catholicity does not bypass or contradict the catholicity of the local church. (b) That a consensus of the faithful should be obtained in every act of reception and this should pass through the local bishops and not be a matter of individuals. In these circumstances one should not hesitate to seek such a ministry in the bishop of Rome.¹⁵²

Afanasev is right, then, to stress the Reichskirchlich nature of the ecumenical council in the undivided Church, and to emphasise the significance of reception of the content of a council's teaching. But he is wrong to overplay the contrast between the ante-Nicene and post-Nicene conciliar forms, to suppose that a doctrine of reception rules out any intrinsic authority for the conciliar institution, and to ignore the need for an organ for recognising that the reception process has taken place. That organ, historically, has been found in the Papacy to whose consideration we must now, and in conclusion, turn. As Lumen Gentium 22 has it, Concilium Oecumenicum numquam datur, quod a successore Petri non sit ut tale confirmatum vel saltem receptum.

IV. The 'church that presides in love': Afanasev's theology of primacy and the dogmatic constitution 'Pastor aeternus'

It is hard to deny that the Papacy has played a major part in the estrangement of the Western and Eastern churches. While claiming to be a ministry of unity in the single Church, it remains in reality a formidable obstacle to reunion.

Le pape, nous le savons bien, est sans doute l'obstacle le plus grave sur la route de l'oecuménisme. Que dirons-nous? Devrons-nous en appeler, une fois de plus, aux titres qui justifient notre mission? Devrons nous, une fois encore, tenter de la présenter en termes exacts, telle réellement qu'elle veut être: principe indispensable de vérité, de charité, d'unité? Mission pastorale de direction, de service, de fraternité....¹⁵³

Thus special interest attaches to Afanasev's remarks on the relation between particular churches and a church claiming

'priority' within the life of the Church as a whole. His comments constitute in effect an attempt to penetrate the impasse between the accustomed positions on these subjects in the Orthodox and Catholic communions.¹⁵⁴

Afanasev was much exercised by the difference in role between various local churches. As a matter of historical fact, certain local churches have exercised authority, whether metropolitical, patriarchal or primatial, vis-à-vis their sister churches. Although in the 1930's Afanasev was markedly suspicious of this historical fact, by the 1950's he had come to give it a much more positive evaluation. His principal concern is to show how such authority does not derogate from the fundamental or ontological equality of the particular churches each of which carries the fulness of life and being of the Catholica. His solution is to re-interpret the authority of such churches as a capacity to give authoritative witness to Christian truth within a communion of love, rather than a juridical authority to execute their policies in other local churches in a context of penally enforced obedience. To some extent, this discussion has in mind the state of things within the Eastern Orthodox communion which is, in effect, a federation of autocephalous churches each of which (with one exception) has such internal 'rankings' of its own, in addition to an overall hierarchy within the 'federation' itself expressed in the title of 'ecumenical patriarch' given to the bishop of the local church of Constantinople-Istanbul. But ultimately what Afanasev has in view is the historic claims of the Roman church and its bishop, which are the principal obstacle to restoration of communion between the Orthodox and Catholic churches.

The possible relation of particular churches to the Roman church is for Afanasev one example, albeit the most important example, of the general principle of the relations that should hold between particular churches and churches in priority at large. According to him, a church in priority has, not a different ontological status from other churches, but a greater power of witness to what is involved in their common ontological order. There is a greater realisation or actualisation of what is always entailed in being a church at all. This intenser realisation of the being of the Church in a local place depends on the history of grace working through divine Providence in the story of Christendom. Because of this fuller presence of the Church in some local churches (although this manner of summarising Afanasev's position already suggests an ontological difference!), one church may come to another to have its grasp of the Christian faith, and its living out of that faith, judged in love. Since what the church not in priority finds in the church in priority is, so to speak, its very own life but in a fuller form, this judgment does not take the character of an external Diktat. Rather, the church not in priority re-finds its own inner mystery and identity in its submission in love to the church that is in priority.

Because of the comparatively modest nature of the claims of the great sees of Eastern Orthodoxy to 'priority', it may be said that Afanasev's theory fits the internal Orthodox situation well enough. Naturally, one can expect that in the course of history, indeed in the present day, particular patriarchal and metropolitan sees may, as a matter of contingent fact, have behaved in a way a good deal less agapeistic than Afanasev's

picture would suggest. But this, it might be argued, is because of the continuing role of sin within the community of Christ's grace. It does not follow from the very structure of the relationships concerned but from a perversion of these structures through the misjudgments and evil choices of those who have worked within them. Thus we find that in a major study which is almost an official statement by the ecumenical patriarchate, Le Patriarcat Oecuménique dans l'Eglise orthodoxe, by the metropolitan Maximus of Sardis, something very like Afanasev's account is proposed for relations between non-primatial and primatial sees. Metropolitan Maximus distinguishes, in a way which is recognisably Afanasev-like, between the order of being of the churches and their historic ordering in a hierarchy. Speaking of the chief pastors of these churches the author writes:

Chaque église en effet a dans la personne de son évêque toute la plénitude des charismes apostoliques, tandis que selon l'ordre canonique inter-ecclésial de l'église universelle, auquel est liée la notion de l'autocéphalie, les évêques ne sont pas égaux en dignité.

In the ontological order, all bishops and their churches have equality of honour: the sacrament of Order, whereby a bishop is consecrated for a given church, is, after all, one and the same for each. However, in the hierarchical ordering of the Church historically, the local churches and their bishops do in fact enjoy different dignities. A confusion of these two orders would lead, according to Maximus, to treating one bishop as simply a representative of another. On the world-wide level, he remarks, this would take the form of papalism, but it might

also be found on a patriarchal level in the form of a 'local papalism'. It seems clear that this author, along with several other contemporary Orthodox ecclesiologists, believes that such a deviation, stigmatised by Alexander Schmemmann as 'Neo-papalism', has in fact occurred in modern Orthodox practice. Although Maximus's account is not as suggestive as that of Afanasev - in particular, he does not really show how the historical hierarchical ordering of the Church is compatible with its ontological egalitarian ordering - what he has to say is an instructive comment on how the Orthodox see the authority of Constantinople as different in kind from the claimed authority of Rome.

Le papisme a commencé dès lors que cette primauté d'honneur a pénétré dans la nature 'ontologique' de l'Eglise et qu'une Eglise, un évêque, est devenu la source de l'ecclésialité pour toutes les autres églises. Tout en refusant inflexiblement cette conception catholique romaine de l'ecclésiologie, l'Eglise orthodoxe a toujours reconnu dans chaque région un premier évêque ... de même qu'elle reconnaît dans l'Eglise universel un premier évêque. Celui-ci, depuis l'époque du schisme, est l'évêque de Constantinople.¹⁵⁵

But to press home the difference between patriarchal and papal claims, Maximus stresses that the ecumenical patriarch does not demand a recognition that his office is of divine origin, nor any immediate jurisdiction over pastors and faithful everywhere, nor a position higher than an ecumenical council and beyond all ecclesial judgment on the part of others. As we shall see, there are certain misunderstandings of the Latin ecclesiological tradition in these remarks.

So far as the patriarchal principle is concerned, it may be

said that it has had a rather chequered history in the thought of the Western Church. Y. Congar has spoken of 'la méconnaissance des patriarchats orientaux par Rome'.¹⁵⁶ Though at the Fourth Lateran Council pope Innocent III recognised that Constantinople held the first place after Rome, he saw the four Eastern patriarchal churches not in terms of the 'five senses' metaphor beloved of supporters of the Pentarchy idea of the later patristic period in the East, but as the four animals 'with many eyes', disposed around the Roman see utique sedes Agni, on the model of the Johannine Apocalypse.¹⁵⁷ Somewhat later Bonaventure considered that the Roman patriarch agreed to be classed with the other four through humility.¹⁵⁸ And in the nearly contemporary profession of faith of the emperor Michael Palaeologus, made in July 1274, the year of Bonaventure's death, the Roman church is said to have honoured the patriarchal sees by bestowing upon them their privileges.¹⁵⁹ While Rome had in any case attempted to work out a Petrine theology of the patriarchal taxis, giving precedence to the Petrine or Petrine-Marcian sees of Antioch and Alexandria, the creation of the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople in 1204 left the way free for the picture of the patriarchates found at Lyons II.¹⁶⁰ The true origins of the patriarchal system in the Eastern affirmation of certain churches as apostolically founded, together with conformation to the civil organisation of the Empire, became theologically irrelevant.¹⁶¹

W. de Vries has proposed that the position of the patriarchs was privileged in regard to the bishops dependent on them, but not in regard to Rome. In the East in the first centuries the custom gradually grew up that individual bishops for the sake of better administration of the

churches, gave up a part of their rights to the patriarchs. In order that a custom in a society becomes a valid right there is needful at least the tacit consent of the head of the society. So too here the tacit consent of the head of the Church, the bishop of Rome, must be supposed. However, the patriarchal power did not grow up through an explicit concession of Rome; still less is it a share in the supreme governing power of the pope: but rather it belongs to the sphere of episcopal jurisdiction.¹⁶²

The popes of the patristic period explicitly recognised the powers of the Alexandrian and Antiochene patriarchs as derived from ancient custom and the canons, especially Canon 6 of Nicaea.¹⁶³ Indeed, this recognition is found as late as the letter of Leo IX to the patriarch Peter of Alexandria in 1052-3.¹⁶⁴ In their replies to patriarchal notices of election, the popes grant communio or consortium, effectively a kind of confirmation, but they do not claim to actually appoint the patriarch.¹⁶⁵ The fundamental idea is rather that the most important acts of local churches must be received by the first patriarch, the head of the entire taxis. The change in papal attitudes to the patriarchal principle has its roots in the disquiet of the Roman church about the meteoric rise of the see of Constantinople. From Leo I onwards, the Roman popes consistently opposed the claims of that see to the first place after Rome, arguing that such pretensions transgressed the Council of Nicaea and, as with Nicholas I, that the Constantinopolitan patriarch owed his status solely to the favour of the Byzantine emperor: 'favore principum potius quam ratione patriarcha ... appellatus est'.¹⁶⁶ When the Roman see finally accepted the place of Constantinople,

they stressed that this was a concession out of good-will: the foundation of the later concept that patriarchal privileges were conceded by the Holy See. Though this concept was first applied only to the Latin patriarchates, including that of Constantinople, the basis for extending it to the Oriental patriarchates was unfortunately laid. For Lyons II, the power of the Holy See is the unique source of all rights and powers of the patriarchs.¹⁶⁷ Though the Council of Florence would assure to the Greek church the full rights and privileges of their patriarchs, nevertheless the interpretation of those rights and privileges by many Latin theologians differed from the Greek.¹⁶⁸ Thus for John of Turrecremata, the conciliar affirmation means simply that the Holy See does not intend to diminish the privileges which it has conferred.¹⁶⁹ Here as elsewhere in the matter of the Eastern Schism, it was historical developments of the Crusading period which paved the way for further mutual estrangement. The notion that the confirmation of patriarchs was a bestowal of office, expressed in the sending of the pallium to them as to Western metropolitans, was the symbolic crown of the new Western conception.¹⁷⁰ The decree De Ecclesiis Orientalibus Catholicis of the Second Vatican Council, by promising to restore to the patriarchates the rights they had before the schism, is a necessary prelude to reunion for:

humanly speaking, reunion between East and West can be hoped for only if the Catholic Church makes whatever concessions are possible to the separated Eastern churches on the question of the autonomy of the patriarchates.¹⁷¹

In this respect, the account of the patriarchal office found

in the Second Vatican Council's Unitatis redintegratio fulfils a series of prophetic anticipations by the far-seeing over the last hundred years.¹⁷² The attempts made to distinguish in that period between the roles of Western patriarch and supreme pastor, vital to a restoration of the patriarchal principle, range from that of Vladimir Solovyev through the work of the Austrian Byzantinist Albert Ehrhard and the Greek Catholic priest Georges Calavassy to, most recently, that of Y. Congar.¹⁷³ Pope Leo XIII stressed its full compatibility with Roman Catholic church teaching in his 1894 letter Orientalium dignitas.¹⁷⁴ The conviction that the patriarchal and pontifical or papal principles are compatible is implicit in the documents of the Second Vatican Council, which, on the one hand, subsume the teaching of the First Vatican Council on the nature of the Petrine ministry of the Roman bishop, while, on the other, re-affirming the patriarchal ministry in the Church. It is to the nature of the Petrine office that we must now turn.

The self-understanding of the Roman church and its bishop are expressed in a great variety of monuments: literary texts, liturgical texts, art-works of various kinds. But there is fortunately no need to review these here, as the self-understanding in question has been decisively summed up in a general council of the Catholic Church, the First Council of the Vatican meeting in 1869-70. Its dogmatic teaching on the primacy of the Roman bishop in the constitution Pastor aeternus, reaffirmed as that was at the Second Vatican Council and most notably in Lumen Gentium, may be taken as the key to the manner in which the Catholic Church considers the particular church of Rome as

the church that predsedatelstvuje v lyubvi, 'presides in love' over the universal communion.¹⁷⁵

The constitution opens with a statement of the wider ecclesiological rationale of the papal office, and of the need to express the main characteristics of that office in a solemn definition. This important prologue comprises three sections: the first on the foundation of the Church, as one body reflecting the unity of Father and Son; the second on the need for the pastors of the Church themselves to remain united in their mission of building up the Church, and the third on the 'necessity' in a time of special peril to the Church to define more closely the nature of the Petrine primacy which guards the unity of the episcopate, itself the guarantee of the unity of the Church. Following this preamble there follow four 'chapters': on the 'apostolic institution' of the primacy in Peter; on the perpetuity of this Petrine primacy in the Roman bishops; on the extent and significance of the primacy of the Roman bishop, and finally on his infallible magisterium.¹⁷⁶ In what follows, the meaning of the resultant text will be established by reference to its historico-theological context. This will then ground an enquiry into whether 'developed' Catholic teaching on the unique priority of the Roman church and bishop can be translated into the very different conceptuality of Afanasev's preferred ecclesiological style.

The story of the genesis of the text has been admirably recounted by Roger Aubert in his study Vatican I.¹⁷⁷ Aubert's account prescind, however, from the further ecclesiological background to the document. For the claims of the Roman church to primacy of government (jurisdiction) and teaching authority

(infallibility) were not the creation of nineteenth century Ultramontanism. One must bear in mind the genesis of such claims in the patristic period, especially at Rome itself;¹⁷⁸ the impetus given them by the Gregorian reform of the eleventh century;¹⁷⁹ their formulation in the Mendicant ecclesiology of such figures as the Dominican Thomas Aquinas and the Franciscan Peter d'Olivieri;¹⁸⁰ and the new currency which they obtained in the age of the Counter-Reformation through the writings of such Catholic apologists as Robert Bellarmine.¹⁸¹ This background will not be adverted to further here, except insofar as, for the conciliar fathers of the First Vaticanum it provided a resource of texts and references. The more immediate background to the controversies of the Council about the Roman primacy was, as Aubert makes clear, the struggle between Ultramontanes and Gallicans in the Catholic Church since the end of the ancien régime with the Great Revolution of the West in 1789.¹⁸² On the theological and canonical level, this struggle concerned the relative place in the Church's constitution of, respectively, pope and bishops. Ultramontanes of the period stressed the special rights and privileges enjoyed by the Roman bishop, his primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church and his personal infallibility. Gallicans insisted on the collegial aspect of the Church's structure, affirming that the supreme authority is invested in the whole body, and alleging the necessity of at least a tacit ratification of papal decisions by the episcopate, as well as claiming fairly considerable authority for local, generally national, churches. At the ecclesiastico-political level, the central issue was the degree of reciprocal dependence appropriate between the civil power

and Church authority. Ultramontanes demanded a total independence for the Church vis-à-vis the State in such matters as episcopal election and religious teaching, and asserted the 'indirect' at least dependence of the civil power on the Church in 'mixed' questions affecting both. ('Indirect' because mediated through the Church's role as a moral, rather than strictly doctrinal, guide). The Gallicans, on the other hand, affirmed the independence of the civil power both in its own sphere and, following a theory of the divine origin of temporal government, the Church's dependence thereon for all that was not purely spiritual - including such exterior manifestations of ecclesial life as councils, the publication of religious documents, the choice of pastors and so forth.¹⁸³

The clearest expression of Gallicanism is to be found in the four Gallican Articles of 1682 in which the bishops of France, under pressure from Louis XIV, laid down the rights of the church and state of France vis-à-vis the Holy See.

1. The Pope has no temporal authority, direct or indirect, in the affairs of states nor the power to depose sovereigns.
2. The General Council, as decreed by the Council of Constance, has authority over the Pope.
3. The exercise of apostolic power is to be regulated by the canons of the Church and in France by the laws and customs of the Gallican Church.
4. In questions of faith, the Pope's decrees apply to all Churches but his judgment is not final unless the consent of the Church be given to it.¹⁸⁴

But the particular form which Gallicanism took in early nineteenth century Western Europe was Febronianism, an

ecclesiological theory proposed by Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim (1707-1790), auxiliary bishop of Trier, under the pseudonym 'Justinus Febronius'.¹⁸⁵ The thesis of Hontheim's De statu Ecclesiae is that, through the influence of the so-called 'Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals', a ninth century Carolingian canon collection, the Roman church and bishop claims many powers not given it by Christ nor exercised in the Church during the first eight centuries.¹⁸⁶ The true scope of the pope's primacy is to effect unity, to assure 'vigilance' in the maintenance of agreed canons, and to promulgate fresh canons enacted by a general council which itself may be called indifferently by pope, emperor or bishops. The pope has no jurisdiction outside his own see (which need not be Rome), for all bishops are equal. Infallibility resides in the whole Church, and only the consent of the bishops makes papal pronouncements binding. Hontheim looked to better instruction of the people, the creation of national synods and appeal to the royal power as means for nullifying the influence of the Roman curia and bringing about the reunion of Christendom. Febronianism grew out of a combination of Jansenism, Gallicanism and regalism, with more distant memories of Conciliarism as a stimulus. Hontheim was influenced by two notable canonists, Zeger Bernhard van Espen and Georg Christoph Neller. Espen, a professor at the Collegium Hadriani Sexti at Louvain, provided the canonical arguments for the consecration of the Jansenist Cornelius Steenhoven to the see of Utrecht in 1724, by unauthorised electors and without the permission of the Holy See. Hontheim was among his pupils. Neller was a Gallican jurist who came from Würzburg to Trier to teach in

the seminary there. His Principia juris publici ecclesiastici was perhaps the single main source of Hontheim's material.¹⁸⁸ The theses of Febronianism appealed to those rulers who wished to subordinate the Church to the interests of the State, in the light of the Aufklärung concept of sovereignty. It provided a theological rationalisation for the movement, centred on the Habsburg domains and beginning in the reign of Maria Theresia (1717-1780) but dubbed 'Josephinism' after her son Joseph II (1741-1790).¹⁸⁹

By far the most sophisticated ecclesiological writer in the Gallican background of Pastor aeternus was, however, the Brescia theologian Pietro Tamburini (1737-1827), who constructed a doctrine of the Church with affinities to Hontheim's from a position of sympathy with the ecclesiastical policies of Joseph II.¹⁹⁰ Described by one modern student as 'il maggiore teologo giansenista d'Italia',¹⁹¹ Tamburini was designated professor of moral theology at Pavia by Maria Theresia, and enjoyed considerable renown under Joseph II and Leopold II. His Jansenism led him to reject the bull Unigenitus, supporting his action by the argument that the vox Ecclesiae is found only in the free and unanimous consent of the corpus pastorum, whether assembled in general council or dispersed. In his Praelectiones de iustitia christiana et de sacramentis he claims that the ecclesiastical power and the care of the churches have been confided solidariter to the body of pastors, bishops and presbyters together. Tamburini demanded the regular convocation of general councils, as proposed by the late mediaeval councils of the West.¹⁹² In La Vera idea della Santa Sede Tamburini amplified these theses in a full scale ecclesiological account

of the ministry of the Roman pope. The Church is composed of the ensemble of clergy and the Christian people. When the pope, as bishop of Rome, speaks to this totality, his voice is only a particular judgment. If he speaks together with the local church of Rome, he expresses only the sentiment of that church. For his judgments to have universal value they must receive the morally unanimous consent of all the churches - just as a bishop in his own diocese only expresses the opinion of his church if he has the consent of his cures. The Roman congregations are, therefore, Tamburini concludes, only the private councillors of the pope and cannot express in and of themselves the opinion of the Roman church. The pope must not absorb the rights of patriarchs or of metropolitans. His jurisdiction of primacy gives him a right of inspection and vigilance. This means that the pope can so act as to obtain the observation of those canons which the Church has established in order to conserve the integrity of the faith, the purity of morals and the good order of her general discipline, together with the constant usages of each particular church. The pope has no immediate jurisdiction over the dioceses of other bishops, each of whom has the right to do in his diocese whatever the pope has the right to do in the diocese of Rome. The faithful depend only on their own bishop: they owe obedience to the pope only via the channel of their bishop. So far as episcopal authority is concerned, each bishop is the pope's equal and (thus) the authority of all bishops united to represent the universal Church exceeds that of the pope. The primacy constitutes the pope head of the universal Church with

the power to represent the whole Church. But such a power to represent depends on his remaining in accord with the universal Church. The primacy also gives him a right to intervene in the affairs of other churches: a right of vigilance over all other dioceses, whereas the rest of the episcopate have, rather, the special duty to occupy themselves chiefly with their own diocese. While the rest of the episcopate is not absolved from taking a responsible interest in what happens to the faithful of the entire world, outside their own dioceses they can only use counsel, advice, remonstrance: not authority or command. The pope, on the other hand, has, as we have seen, the right to make the other bishops obey him, following the canons: but the duty of the bishops to obey the pope is precisely canonical, not absolute. In the administration of his diocese, something which he consults with his clerus, the bishop is responsible only to God. In accord with his clergy, he can govern his diocese as he pleases, saving only those matters which concern faith, morals and the general discipline of the Church. He has full liberty to maintain or reject liturgical rites, for example, and to introduce new ones. The pope has no right to excommunicate directly, outside the diocese of Rome.¹⁹³ This is a theology which, in its concern with the equality of local churches, what Afanasev would term their tsennost, 'absolute value', ravnotsennost, 'equivalent value', and nepovtorimost, 'inimitability', appears at first sight to approach the work of the Russian theologian. However, it is notable that Tamburini's terms of reference, like those of Honthelm, are above all canonical. It thus remains an open question as to whether, at a more fundamental level of the

ontology of grace in the Church, they correspond to Afanasev's vision more adequately than the critique of them found in Pastor aeternus.

Gallican and Febronian ideas, to a considerable degree realised under Josephist and Napoleonic influence over large areas of Austria, Italy and France at the start of the nineteenth century, enjoyed fresh currency among Liberals as the century progressed. However, the Catholic clergy in the first half of the nineteenth century showed themselves less and less amenable to such 'regalian' notions in the sphere of Church-State relations: frequently, indeed, local bishops appealed to the Roman bishop in order to free themselves from such encumbrances. But this tendency also facilitated the triumph of Ultramontane ideas in the area of theology proper. At Rome itself the developing influence of such notions had at first been left to go its own sweet way, but by the middle years of the century the Papacy began to support overtly what it had earlier merely looked on with a distant benevolence.¹⁹⁴ The immediate historical origin of the document Pastor aeternus is to be found in the desire of the Roman bishops to harness the resources of all the local churches of the Catholica for the struggle against anti-Christian notions. As Aubert puts it:

A Rome, où l'on craignait de heurter de front les gouvernements, hostiles par principe à une plus grande intervention du pape dans la vie des Eglises nationales, on avait au début laissé le mouvement ultramontain se développer spontanément au plan local, sans encourager ouvertement, mais vers le milieu du siècle, on estima que les choses étaient suffisamment mûres pour pouvoir sortir de cette réserve et qu'il était d'autant plus

opportun de le faire que l'accentuation de la centralisation pontificale constituerait le meilleur moyen de grouper autour d'un centre d'impulsion unique toutes les énergies catholiques qu'on tendrait contre la montée du libéralisme antichrétien.¹⁹⁵

The Ultramontane ecclesiology, as it gathered ever more adherents, was looked on with considerable suspicion by the Oriental Catholic churches, whose traditional vision of the Church was of a quite different theological order. But many bishops (and even more of the lower clergy and laity) rallied to it, whether in the hope that it would aid them in their own tussles with government, or out of the feeling that in a world whose confines were reduced by steamship, railway and telegraph, attachment to regional autonomy was anachronistic. However, it is necessary to distinguish here between moderate Ultramontanes (frequently 'converts' in traditionally Gallican churches) and those whom the historian of the English Catholic Revival, Wilfrid Ward, dubbed 'Neo-Ultramontanes'.¹⁹⁶ The simplistic ecclesiology of the latter, animated by the desire for a wholly centralised Church, affected to define the Church as 'the society of the faithful governed by the Pope', thus eliminating the episcopal order as such from serious ecclesiological consideration. On this view, the pastoral government of the bishops was delegated from the pope, while their teaching 'authority' consisted simply in the duty to pass on his teaching to the faithful committed to their care. Infallible papal teaching itself was generously estimated: infallibility was deemed to extend to any papal declaration whose wording had some air of solemnity about it, even if its subject-matter were religious-political rather than strictly dogmatic or even ethical. It was, moreover, conceived as 'separate infallibility', without

intrinsic relation to the charisma veritatis certum of the episcopate at large, much less to the chrisma of right believing ascribed by I John 2, 27 to all the faithful.¹⁹⁷

The extremism of the Neo-Ultramontanes quite naturally aroused a Neo-Gallican opposition, especially in the German University faculties (here Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger, professor of Church history at Munich from 1826 to 1873 was a central figure),¹⁹⁸ but also in France (where the moderate Gallicanism inherited from Bossuet maintained itself in favour among a section of the episcopate)¹⁹⁹ and England (where John Emerich Edward D'Alberg Acton, later Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge proved a lay stalwart and political organiser of genius).²⁰⁰ A considerable number of the bishops of Austria-Hungary also adhered to Gallican views, for a variety of motives, ranging from satisfaction with the ecclesiastical status quo, noteworthy among the occupants of such great sees as Vienna, Prague, Estzergom, to a desire not to alienate further the Orthodox, visible in bishops whose churches were adjacent to the Orthodox world, such as Joseph Georg Strossmayer, bishop of Diakovár in Croatia from 1850 to 1905.²⁰¹ It was by way of inter-action, then, among these opposing forces that the text of Pastor aeternus came to be hammered out.

The task now before us is to establish the sense of the central affirmations of Pastor aeternus on the role of the Roman church and bishop, over against the theological movements of Gallicanism and Ultramontanism, with a view to ascertaining their possible congruence with Afanasev's ecclesiological proposals. A narrative reconstruction of the document is placed at this point not for its own sake but to throw light

on the predominant theological concerns of both 'minority' and 'majority' parties as reflected in the final text. The issue of the primacy and infallibility of the Roman Church came on to the conciliar agenda early. Seven out of thirty-two bishops originally consulted about the scope of the council's work had proposed a definition of papal infallibility. A preparatory commission had received a draft ecclesiological text from Giovanni Perrone of the Collegio Romano on errors relative to the Church and its rights. On this basis, Perrone's colleague Klemens Schrader was invited to produce a much fuller text De Ecclesia Christi. This draft spoke, in the context of the Church's organisation, of 'pastors and doctors given by Christ', the subject of a threefold power of magisterium, ministry and jurisdiction (Chapter X). The document went on to say that Christ has invested Peter and his successors with a primacy which implies a true power of governing, supreme and universal in character, the consequence of which is that the pope has the right to communicate freely with pastors and faithful (Chapter XI). There was no mention of papal infallibility.²⁰² But by the time that this document was circulated to the council fathers (January 1870), a good deal of informal debate on the issue had already taken place not only on the floor of the council, but in the salons of Rome, in newspapers, not to mention University common rooms and Government chanceries. In response to the increasingly vocal opposition of the liberal bishops, 380 Infallibilists added their names to a formula arising from the floor of the house and asserting that the authority of the Roman pontiff is exempt from all error when, in matters of faith and morals, he

determines and prescribes what all the faithful have to believe and hold or to reject and condemn.²⁰³ A more moderate formula secured the adhesion of some 68 bishops. These initiatives led to the preparation of a major document on the inopportuneness of a definition, in the hope that Pius IX, like Pius IV at Trent, would withdraw from conciliar discussion any propositions that aroused grave dissent among the fathers. But a 'tiers parti', realising that the great majority of the bishops were favourable to a definition, began to concern themselves with the attempt to mitigate its terms. It was because of all this activity that the Deputation of the Faith withdrew from the consideration of the council Schrader's section on the Roman bishop, realising that some kind of definition of infallibility would have to be inserted there. Hence, it was the truncated hulk of the Schrader text that was submitted to the council, where both its innovatory introduction of an ecclesiology of the mystical body, and its absence of references to the episcopate aroused hostile comment, even - on the latter point - from Ultramontanes. The text was then given to yet a third Roman Jesuit, Joseph Kleutgen, for re-working, and so was produced - minus a segment on the Roman Pontiff - the final schema on the Church. But for the premature closure of the council as a result of the worsening military-political situation of the Temporal Power, this is the document which would then have been voted on by the episcopate.²⁰⁴

On 6 March 1870, Pius IX, having pondered the matter for three weeks, agreed to the request of the commission encharged with counselling the pope on the petitions of the council fathers that a definition of papal infallibility should be included in the schema De Ecclesia Christi. Before the Council

had ever opened, attention had been given to a text on this subject pour parer, as Aubert puts it, à toute éventualité. The doctrinal commission had received five draft documents on the Roman pontiff, three on the primacy (Cossa, Perrone, Hettinger), one on the temporal power (Adragna), and finally one on infallibility (Cardoni). Finding the notion of papal infallibility 'parfaitement définissable', the commission invited a draft definition, contextualised within a statement of the entire role of the Roman bishop in the Church. This was initially provided by Franz Hettinger but as his work was considered too prolix, the job was handed to Schrader. In fact, the eventual document distributed to the fathers - owing a good deal to Dechamps of Malines and Manning of Westminster, as well as to Cardinal Bilio - differed from both those of Cardoni and Schrader.²⁰⁵ The most important change involved in the Dechamps-Manning-Bilio text was that whereas Schrader's document had referred to the Church's infallibility but the pope's inerrancy (inerrantia), the new text spoke explicitly of papal infallibility - in effect identifying the two concepts, Romani pontificis inerrantiae seu infallibilitatis praerogativam. Furthermore, the object of this infallibility was formulated in a highly generous manner as whatever in faith and morals must be admitted, tenendum, by the whole Church. The conditions of the exercise of infallibility were vague: instead of speaking, as had the classic loci theologici in earlier writing, of ex cathedra definitions, the text had rather: 'cum supremi omnium christianorum doctoris munere fungens pro auctoritate definit'.²⁰⁶

The council fathers were given ten days to respond to Chapter XI of the draft de ecclesia on papal primacy, as well

as to this new chapter on infallibility. At the request of the minority, this period was extended by a week. During these three weeks, discussion among the bishops centred as much on papal jurisdiction as on papal infallibility. And here in Aubert's words:

A quelques rares exceptions près, tous les pères admettaient la doctrine quant au fond mais le chapitre avait été élaboré dans une perspective nettement anticollégiale et insistait sur le fait que ce n'est pas le collège des Apôtres qui possède le pouvoir suprême dans l'Eglise mais Pierre, en tant que vicaire du Christ, distinct à ce titre de ses frères.²⁰⁷

The protest of many was directed against the statement that the primacy took the form of a universal potestas that was ordinaria atque immediata. Firstly, the term ordinaria was ambiguous, and its double meaning was rendered dangerous by the addition of immediata. It was understood that, theologically, ordinarius meant no more than that the pope's power vis-à-vis the churches of other bishops was intrinsic, his very own. Yet the meaning of the word in general usage could surely infect the term. It might be taken to licence the pope's habitual intervention in the governance of local churches 'as a matter of ordinary practice'.

A second objection concerned the unilateralism of the account of Church jurisdiction offered, in that so little was said of the prerogatives of the bishops. This was understandably regarded as likely to arouse the anxieties of, in particular, the Oriental Catholics, who had not shared in the historical process which had changed the Western patriarchate into a highly centralised structure.²⁰⁸ The notorious 'scene' between Pius IX and the Chaldaean patriarch Audo did nothing to allay

these anxieties. To the attacks of the minority were added a number of proposed amendments made by moderates in the majority, and especially Filippo Maria Guidi, O.P., archbishop of Bologna. These amendments bore the general character of wishing to see an affirmation of the divine origin of both pontifical and episcopal jurisdiction, and of the harmony that should join them. At the same time, extreme members of the majority were also pressing for a sharpening of the Ultramontane tendency of the text.

However, by far the largest number of proposed amendments (139 compared with 88 for Chapter XI on jurisdiction), concerned the supplementary draft on infallibility. A number of fathers were totally opposed to the inclusion of such a text in the schema: either because they held it to be pastorally inopportune in the concrete circumstances, or because they believed it to involve insuperable difficulties, either in the historical or the theological order. Others questioned the arguments of partisans of the definition, proposing to postpone a decision until the question was riper. Yet others, in principle favourable to a definition, proposed either to improve the argumentation or to either strengthen or, contrastingly, nuance the presentation of the doctrine. Among those who wished to nuance it, a number saw the possibility of winning over some of the minority if a text with sufficient inbuilt qualifications could be produced. The intensity of feeling in both the minority and zelanti groups, together with the often inflammatory language of the press, counselled caution to all concerned, and in or around 15 March, that is, ten days before the expiral of the discussion period, Pius IX himself assured de Bonnechose

of Rouen, a representative of the tiers-parti, that, far from wanting to impose on the council fathers the formula distributed earlier in March, he desired

qu'on étudie bien librement les termes par lesquels doit être défini le pouvoir du pontife romain.²⁰⁹

The agitated state of the assembly was further evidenced by a concerted move on the part of a large number of the bishops, chiefly but not exclusively strong infallibilists, to remove Chapter XI and the document on pontifical infallibility from the De Ecclesia and set it up into a little constitution of its own, consisting of four chapters, which should then be voted on prior to the rest of the schema - thus allowing opinion to cool off for the rest of the council's ecclesiological work. On 29 April the council presidents, with the exception of the primate of Hungary, John Simor, agreed to this request. On the suggestion of the archbishop of Saragossa, the text would be entitled, Constitutio dogmatica I de Ecclesia. Those were not lacking who argued for the new arrangement on the grounds that the mini-constitution treated of the foundation of the Church: thus, for example, d'Avanzo of Calvi, a representative of the Deputation for the Faith.²¹⁰

The Deputation for the Faith sat from 27 April to 8 May, considering the amendments suggested by the bishops to both parts of the new constitution: that is, on primacy and infallibility. The old Chapter XI and draft on infallibility were then reworked by Schrader, assisted by Senestrey of Ratisbon's canon-theologian Maier, with a view to incorporating the motives of the definition (in effect, an account of the wider theological meaning it possessed), and also to stressing

the significance of the pope's primacy of jurisdiction, now qualified by the term 'episcopal'. The Deputation proceeded to amplify further this prologue, and also to introduce, at the suggestion of Spalding of Baltimore, the assertion that the denomination of papal jurisdiction as 'episcopal' must not be taken to mean that what was affirmed of the pope could be opposed to the jurisdiction of the bishops. On the proposal of Martin of Paderborn, an important nuance was added to the chapter on infallibility. Here the verb tenere, 'to hold' or 'admit', was dropped from the text in respect of the description of the object of infallibility. No longer was that object to be 'whatever in matters of faith or morals must be admitted by the whole Church' - which might well extend to theological doctrines and 'dogmatic facts' as well as to revealed truths of themselves. Instead, credere filled the place left empty by the ousted verb, indicating that the object of infallibility was no more (and no less) than the content of the original Christian revelation, the Gospel itself.²¹¹

The discussion opened then on 13 May and was introduced by a general report from Pie of Poitiers, for the Deputation. He recognised that logic would have required as a first stage a consideration of the entire structure of the De ecclesia, but justified the modification of the normal order by the need to regulate as quickly as possible the troubled atmosphere of the council. In relation to Chapter III, he tried to efface the unfortunate impression left by Schrader that the document presented the bishops as 'lower' pastors. On the contrary, the bishops were not simply vicars of the pope: here he expounded the notion of the co-existence of two powers both

immediate and ordinary. Furthermore, he underlined that if some had spoken of the 'personal and separate infallibility' of the pope, this should not at all be taken as implying that the privilege of inerrancy belonged to the pope as a private person or that he, the pope, could be set over against the Church as if a head could live independently of its body. The general debate which followed lasted from 14 May to 3 June. While some fathers, and notably the Melchite patriarch Youssif, were concerned primarily with the third chapter, on the primacy, the debate was dominated by the theme of the theological possibility (and opportuneness) of a definition of infallibility. Dechamps of Malines had some success in distinguishing between the Neo-Ultramontane view of the papacy which the Deputation for the Faith was not proposing, and the theologically traditional doctrine of Thomas and Bellarmine which it was. On 2 June, after 65 speeches on the topic, many repetitive, the presidents received a request for a closure of the debate signed by 150 fathers. This decision, though theoretically justifiable, was deeply resented by the minority. On 6 June, examination of the text chapter by chapter at last began. The prologue and the two first chapters were dealt with in two sessions - though the Deputation for the Faith was constrained to add a reference in the prologue to the divine institution of the episcopate.²¹² The discussion of the third chapter occupied five sessions, and a number of oriental bishops, especially the Roumanians Vancsa of Fogaras and Papp-Szilagyí of Grosswardein, together with the Melchite patriarch and several bishops of the Latin minority renewed their objections to the terms episcopalis, ordinaria, immediata.²¹³ The Oriental anxiety was chiefly

about the rights of patriarchal bishops, the Latin more a doubt as to how two persons could both enjoy ordinary and immediate power over the same portion of the Lord's flock - and also the fear that the assertions could introduce unbridled papal interventionism. To some extent these anxieties were allayed by the attempt of spokesmen for the Deputation to show that the two powers in question were not equal and concurrent, but hierarchised. At the same time, bishops of the majority pointed out the various historical ways in which papal intervention in particular churches had been for the wider good of the whole Church.

On 15 June debate opened on the infallibility chapter. It is significant that Aubert's section thereon in his history of the council is entitled 'A la recherche d'une formule transactionnelle pour l'infaillibilité':

Les partisans d'une définition avaient mieux perçu la complexité du problème et la nécessité d'être prudent; si rares étaient ceux qui avaient carrément changé de camp, du moins Hefele constatait-il qu'une partie d'entre eux envisageaient à présent un mezzo-terme. De leur côté, les opposants avaient pu constater que beaucoup d'infaillibilistes ne partageaient pas les excès des néo-ultramontains et que la foi de l'Eglise en la matière était beaucoup plus générale et plus ferme que certaine d'entre eux ne le supposaient en arrivant à Rome.²¹⁴

A large number of opponents of the definition offered in the Deputation were agreed that the Gallican thesis requiring a subsequent accord of the episcopate before a papal definition could be deemed infallible would not do. On the other hand, they feared that the draft definition as it stood might imply

that the 'pope is the Church'. Consequently, what they wished to see was some indication that the pope in defining simply reflects the Church's faith, a faith of which the bishops are the authorised witnesses. Moderate infallibilists, convergently, admitted that the pope had the grave moral duty not to define until he had actualised all the means available to locate the Church's faith, of which the consultation of the episcopate or the calling of a general council were the most obvious. But when pressed to articulate this idea in the formulation of the definition itself, they demurred. It was feared that Gallicanism would return by the back door if one added such a phrase as consensu episcoporum or ecclesiarum, stipulating then, a necessary intervention by the bishops. At the same time, the extreme infallibilists such as Manning were pressing for an abandonment of the restrictions on the object of infallibility added by the Deputation, and a return to the earlier formula.²¹⁵

Considerable play was made during the discussion of a distinction posed in the fourteenth century by the Dominican theologian Antoninus of Florence. This distinguished between the pope acting by his own movement, in his personal name, motu proprio, singularis, and the pope appealing to the advice and aid of the universal Church, utens consilio et requirens adiutorium universalis Ecclesiae: infallibility coming into play only in this second case.²¹⁶ Furthermore, Guidi of Bologna attempted to rally more of the tiers-parti by pointing out a second vital distinction, which itself was meant to show in what sense the pope depends on the rest of the Church for an infallible judgment. Guidi proposed that while the bishops do not confer on the pope whatever is necessary for him to make such a judgment,

nevertheless he must inform himself of what they believe in order to be enlightened on the content of Tradition. But while this second distinction appeared at one point to re-unite the Council for the first time since its opening, the Deputation for the Faith, under pressure from Pius IX, declared it to be unacceptable at any rate within the formulation of the definition itself. While not refusing to include it in the chapter on infallibility, to include it in the defining formula was thought to set juridical rather than moral limits on the pope's ability to define, vis-à-vis the episcopate.

On 9 July, the Deputation for the Faith offered to the assembly a re-working of Chapter IV on infallibility in the light of the amendments proposed. Edited by Franzelin and Kleutgen, the re-worked text had a number of striking features whose bearing was brought out in the remarkable exposition of it by Gasser of Brixen for the Deputation for the Faith, beginning on 11 July. Probably the most theologically assured address of the Council, this speech remains of the highest value for a correct interpretation of Pastor aeternus.²¹⁷ The principal change consisted in the inclusion of the technical phrase ex cathedra: and while the crucial verb tenendum returned at the expense of credendum, the relevant paragraph spoke only of doctrinal definitions in this connexion, thus clearly eliminating the civil teachings which many feared might otherwise be brought under the definition. Moreover, von Ketteler of Mainz noted with satisfaction that the new text (the seventh, all told!) did not present the pope as 'independent' of the Church in the exercise of his infallibility. Gasser underlined the rights of the bishops, and the intimate union between pope and Church, and

the precise conditions required before a pontifical decree be deemed infallible. He also pushed aside the Neo-Ultramontane view that the infallibility of the Church resides in the pope alone, being communicated to the Church simply by him alone. But at the same time, Gasser indicated the limits beyond which the Deputation would not go by way of concession to the minority: above all, that there could be no strict and absolute necessity of recourse to the episcopate prior to the making of an ex cathedra pronouncement. This statement was deeply disappointing to the bishops of the minority. Dechamps wrote to Ketteler a long letter on 13 July explaining that the phrase consensu ecclesiarum could not be added, since it was equivocal. Either it could mean, as with Bellarmine, the fact of the accord of the churches (or the bishops), and this certainly the pope could not dispense with. Or it could mean the act of consent by the bishops, and here it was necessary to state that such an act was not necessary. But despite all explications, when on 13 July the bishops had to vote on the entire project, a quarter of the assembly signalled its disagreement. This led to further negotiations, the central feature of which was the mission of Georges Darboy of Paris to Pius IX with the mediating formula: testimonio Ecclesiae innixus, or et mediis quae semper in Ecclesia catholica usurpata fuerunt adhibitis. However, other French bishops and especially Freppel of Angers, warned the pope that these formulae would offer an escape-clause to Gallicanism, and that it was vital to affirm that the definitiones (were) ex esse irreformabiles - quin sit necessarius consensus episcoporum sive antecedens, sive concomitans, sive subsequens.²¹⁸ That evening, the Deputation which until now

had resisted the inclusion of this type of language, agreed to add the famous clausula (ex sese) non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae. The definitive vote, on 18 July, received the positive acclamation of 535 bishops, some 42 having left Rome rather than scandalise the faithful by publicly voting non placet.²¹⁹ The battle of Pastor aeternus was over.

What, then, are we left with in terms of doctrinal claims put forward by this Council which must certainly be regarded as both legitimately constituted and fully 'received' from within the Catholic tradition, though not, of course, by the Orthodox? Fundamentally, we have two interconnected dogmatic statements, corresponding to Chapters III and IV respectively of the final text agreed by the conciliar fathers. Firstly, we have a claim to a primacy of action (government)²²⁰ on the part of the Roman bishop, a right to act wherever in the Church which, however, is said not to dissolve but on the contrary to strengthen the proper action of the local bishop: or, more widely, then, the divinely given structure of the particular church. It is important to note at this juncture that the scope and conditions of this primacy of action are said to be themselves not capable of expression in canonical terms. The description of the right as 'immediate and ordinary' is simply a way of saying, as we have seen, that the ministry in question is of its nature vested in that of the Roman bishop. It in no way specifies the outward character of the action concerned, much less its frequency.²²¹ Secondly, we have a connected claim to a primacy of magisterium (teaching) on the part of the Roman bishop. Once again, this primacy is said to be not limited by the antecedent, concomitant or subsequent consent of the episcopate in any way which can be

given legal form. It is stressed that the Roman bishop has the moral duty to consult the organs of Tradition, of which the minds of the bishops, as witnesses and judges of the faith of local churches is a vital example. Moreover, in the light of the preamble of Pastor aeternus, where the entire raison d'être of the Petrine ministry is said to consist in its capacity to unify the episcopate, and thereby the entire people of God, the natural assumption is that discovering the mind of the pars gravior of the episcopate is the normal way in which the Roman bishop will consult Tradition. The complex story of the making of Pastor aeternus has been recounted above in such a way as to highlight the distinctive contributions of 'minority' and 'majority' - the former insisting that the primatial church and bishop must edify and not undermine the Christ-given sacramental structure of the Church, the latter determined that in this the scope of primatial ministry cannot be canonically circumscribed.

In effect, the refusal to limit canonically the role of the Roman church and bishop in both ruling and teaching removes that role from the canonical sphere to a new context in the wider, ontological realm of grace in the Church. It opens the way to a relecture of Pastor aeternus, its re-possession within a theological hermeneutic not immediately its own.²²² It is here that Afanasev's key concepts of loving presidency, authoritative witness and definitive reception came into their own. Though Afanasev makes surprisingly little use of the term, an eucharistic ecclesiology must be an ecclesiology of communion. The Church is a koinōnia, understood as an interactive sisterhood of communities, each with the Eucharist as its source and the bishop as its president. Within this communion,

the Roman church and bishop have the responsibility of primatial action, understood theologically and so prior to any attempt at canonical exemplification. By this action the local Roman church and bishop receive or fail to receive the actions of another church, expressing their positive or negative response in the preservation or withdrawal of sacramental communion. Such an intrinsic responsibility of oversight ('ordinary', 'episcopal') is pertinent to every ecclesial situation ('universal', 'immediate'). Similarly, the Roman church and bishop carry the same duty within the koinōnia as regards not this time the practice of faith but its doctrinal articulation. They have a responsibility of primatial magisterium, whereby their reception or non-reception of a proposed doctrinal thesis constitutes the definitive organ of reception for a wider activity of sifting within the communion of churches. Thus an ecclesiology which starts out from the Eucharist, expressing its sense of the One and the Many through exploration of the pre-conditions of Eucharistic celebration, will find in conciliarity and reception the keys to a sound understanding of a church that presides in love. The conciliar koinōnia of churches is not without its prōtos, its primatial agent, while its reception of the teaching of bishops in council has as its own final organ primatial proclamation from the cathedra of that proēstos whose church sits in the centre of the agapē of all.

Conclusion

Afanasev's ecclesiology forms part of a little-studied movement of patristic ressourcement which joins the theology of the twentieth century Russian Diaspora to its late nineteenth century academic counterpart. But the concern with texts was, in his case, far from innocent. Study of the early councils and canons reminded Afanasev all too forcibly of the troubles of the Russian church, inflicted both by the heavy hand of the post-Petrine Tsardom and by the self-made lacerations of jurisdictional disputes after 1917. The desire to avoid a national-societal and a juridical model of the Church found its perfect fulfilment in an ecclesiology built on the Eucharist. The manner in which Afanasev arrived at this ecclesiology made it virtually inevitable that he would find his ideal in the ante-Nicene church. Among Western-born writers the clearest parallel is with the Anglican Benedictine Gregory Dix.¹ Although liturgical experience was doubtless a major factor in the orientation of a priest in so liturgical a church as the Eastern Orthodox, and in a monk, Afanasev and Dix looked to the ante-Nicene period for a solution to what may be deemed in a wide sense the 'political' problems of their respective communions. Unfortunately, owing to the fragmentary character of our access to that period, re-creating the history and consciousness of the pre-Nicene church can only be, in Pierre Batiffol's words, 'une approximation révisable'.² But if there are lacunae in Afanasev's presentation, it is impressive to see how, like Dix, he saw that church as uniting a high doctrine of the local community with a powerful affirmation of the special role of a church that presides in love.³ A Catholic student of an Orthodox theologian may take legitimate pleasure in this

thought, bearing in mind the words of a great scholar of conciliar history:

Die Dekrete sind nicht revisionsfähig, sie sind
ergänzungsfähig.

Indeed the life of the Church, at its deepest and best, is a reaching out towards such ecumenical completeness or wholeness, even though in the last resort it can only be received as grace in the Parousia of Christ.

Appendix A Afanasev and contemporary Russian ecclesiology

A contextualisation of Afanasev against the background of Russian theological tradition, within the ecclesial life of Russia, Serbia and France in his own day and in terms of the movement of patristic ressourcement that he made his own, would not be complete without some attempt to situate him in regard to contemporary Russian ecclesiology. For side by side with Afanasev other Russian theologians, indebted to the same sources and moulded by the same ecclesiastical background, were devoting their attention to the issue of the Church. A consideration of these writers, and notably of N.A. Berdyaev, S.N. Bulgakov and G.V. Florovsky, should indicate both what is common and what is distinctive in Afanasev's use of the resources of a shared tradition: ecclesiology at Russian hands. At the same time, such an enquiry will serve to prepare for a final investigation of the ecumenical potential of Afanasev's work. For the degree of representativeness which his vision can claim within his own tradition must be of importance in an evaluation of the significance of his thought for Orthodox-Catholic rapprochement.

A. Nikolay Aleksandrovič Berdyaev, 1874-1948

Berdyaev's thought, well-known from the angle of the philosophy of religion, has been described theologically as 'durch und durch ekklesiologisch'.¹ It is true that he regarded his work as that of a 'Christian theosophist', and, moreover,

rarely treated explicitly of ecclesiological questions. But by his self-description Berdyaev meant to draw attention to the primarily intuitive, rather than descriptive character of his thought, while implicitness has been the normal mode of ecclesiological expression for most of theological history. Here a summary of Berdyaev's ecclesiology will be offered, with a view to drawing out its consonance with, and possible contributions to, the work of Afanasev.

Berdyaev sees the Church as existing on two levels: on that of spirit as communion, on that of soul as society. To grasp this distinction some account of his fundamental anthropology is necessary. The starting point of reflection for Berdyaev is the intuition of spirit, dukh.² Such an intuition takes the form of a perception of the whole: man as bound together with God and with all creation. This perception is itself an epiphany of the reality underlying an everyday awareness governed, not by a sense of all-unity, but by a sense of separation, disintegration, anxiety and boredom. Human existence lived as wholeness Berdyaev terms 'spirit'; the same existence lived as disintegration he calls 'soul'. In the order of spirit, man is person and ecclesial man communion. In the order of soul, he is object, and ecclesial man society. To spirit belongs freedom; to nature, made up of soul and body, necessity.³ Spirit is the identity of subject and object, soul their fall into separation. With that fall comes the emergence of time from eternity, the dislocation of existence into past, present and future, and the establishment of a logical order within whose laws the language and conceptuality in which spirit comes to expression must necessarily appear as

paradoxical. At the same time, Berdyaev does not deny that soul and body may be hallowed, just as spirit originally fell into the world of objectification which ordinary consciousness now inhabits.⁴ It follows from this analysis that the Church as communion is not only enormously more important than the Church as society but, to a considerable degree, in tension with it.

Though an affirmation of God and Christ can only be made from within this experience of spirit, and so by individual subjects, the Church's corporate tradition nevertheless plays an important part therein. While grace is necessary for the discovery of God, that discovery is fundamentally generated by the realisation that one is spirit. In the experience of spirit one apprehends simultaneously one's own finite reality and the infinite Ground of things mirrored in the finite self.⁵ In regard to Christ, Berdyaev passes over theological criteriology and apologetics, and thus over the historical Jesus and his claims. Accepting a comparison with the German ecstatic Anna Katherina Emmerich (1774-1824), he postulates a direct meeting with the spiritual reality of Christ.⁶ Historic tradition, documentary records and their scientific interpretation, is dead unless quickened thus by the touch of spirit. But Berdyaev contrasts tradition so understood with the 'living' tradition found in the experience of the Church. Ecclesial tradition sheds its own light on historic tradition, filling its signs and symbols with meaning and thereby overleaping the chasm of the centuries.

Through tradition we enter a single spiritual world, the life of a new spiritual race. Tradition is suprapersonal, common (sobornii) experience, creative spiritual life, coming down from one generation to the

next, binding together the quick and the dead, conquering death.... The tradition of the Church is not external authority.... Tradition comes to us from within, overcoming the disintegrative quality of time ... It is the union of past, present and future in a single eternity. Life in the tradition of the Church is a life in eternity. It is the perception and knowledge of realities from within and not from without. The past is not known externally, by means of external fragments of monuments come down to us in history, as historical criticism supposes. Rather, it is known from within: through holy memory, inner encounter, common spiritual life which is victorious over all rupture and externalisation.⁷

This ecclesial mediation of the Logos incarnate reflects the entry of the Logos into history, the purpose of which was to lead the isolated individual into community in and with God. Through the ecclesial consciousness immanent in tradition, man receives the mind of Christ, and more specifically his love and freedom, the supreme characteristics of spirit.

The true nature of the Church is described by Berdyaev in Khomiakovian terms as sobornost. He insists that the Church's essence must be hidden, mysterious, because it belongs to the world of spirit, and not to that of nature. It cannot be grasped in any visible reality, whether liturgy or council, parish or hierarchy. It is experienced, rather, as an unfolding of spirit.

The experience of Church begins when I overcome the narrowness and closedness of my soul's world, when I enter the unity of the great spiritual world, conquer dichotomy and compartmentalisation, become victor over time and space. The spiritual world and spiritual

experience are supra-individual, supra-psychic and potentially ecclesial. The spiritual life is not individualistic but metaphysically social.⁸

Though in the life of spirit, one's own 'I' is perceived as personhood, one's creative power's are developed only through personal meeting with a 'Thou'. This 'Thou-experience' forms the foundation for a 'We-experience', an experience of communion or internalised sociability. Such sobornost forms the ontological constitution of the Church, defined by Berdyaev as sobornii dukh or dukhovnaya sobornost. The Church brings man the 'ecumenicity' that the Spirit needs.

In ecclesial experience I am not alone, I am united with all those who are my brothers according to the spirit, wherever and whenever they may have lived... In the religious-ecclesial experience, in meeting with Christ, man is not alone, left to his own narrowness. He is with all those who have had this experience in whatever time in history, with the whole Christian world, with the apostles, the saints, one's brethren in Christ, the living and the dead. In the Church, the beat of the pulse is felt in the spirit of sobornost as the beating of a single heart.⁹

In this respect, Berdyaev does not distinguish between believers who belong visibly to the Church and unbelievers who may belong to her invisibly. The whole human family is in Christ, as it was in Adam. Everyone who seeks either God or man seeks the God-man.

But the Church is not only Khomiakovian sobornost: it is also, in language drawn from both the Platonist and the Idealist traditions, 'world-soul'. The Church is the 'all-unity', vseedinstvo, in which all that is true and valuable to the

cosmos subsists. Through the Church, Christ realises a divinising process which can be called indifferently the world's 'christification', its transformation by 'the beautiful', or its 'ecclesialisation'.¹⁰ This transformation is achieved by victory over chaos in which the cosmos receives its part in Christ's destiny, moving from crucifixion to resurrection. However, before the Parousia, the definitive appearance of the Kingdom of God, it will always be possible to distinguish between the Church as christified cosmos and the Church as institution. So long as dualism remains in the order of being, there will be a Church that is esoteric, invisible, spiritual, a Gemeinschaft, and a Church that is exoteric, visible, empirical, a Gesellschaft.

What is formed, actualised and historically embodied in the Church is not her bottomless depth and fulness. Further, deeper, lies the infinite. The infinite does not let itself be confined in the finite.¹¹

The visible Church is a symbolisation of the invisible, a reflected reality, inherently ambiguous because sharing in the ambiguity of the entire objectified empirical order.

In this perspective, Berdyaev regards both Catholicism and, to a lesser degree, Orthodoxy as guilty of an indecent attempt to absolutise the visible, historical Church, something especially clear in the institution of the Roman papacy.¹²

Insofar as the Church is not institution but christified world-soul its span includes a far wider human circle than the visible Church can accommodate. Nevertheless, though, in B. Schultze's words: 'Die Gegenüberstellung von sichtbarer und unsichtbarer Kirche tritt bei Berdiajew besonders scharf hervor', he never permits the contrast between them to be turned into outright

opposition.¹³ Indeed, he makes a notable effort to find a place for both.

There are two perspectives: either the Absolute and Infinite invades and consecrates the relative and finite, creating a closed sacred circle, or the finite and relative strives after the Absolute and Infinite by a creative movement. The first perspective is that of the exclusively conservative-sacramental; the second that of the creative-prophetic. The plenitude of Christianity includes both.¹⁴

Of crucial importance here is Berdyaev's account of the Church-world relationship, which frees his thought from a false or introverted ecclesiasticism. He takes issue with the claim of such earlier Russian religious philosophers as V.V. Rozanov and K.N. Leontiev that love for Christ is incompatible with love for the world.¹⁵ Christ's kingdom is not of this world, certainly, yet Christ as the perfect Son of God is the archetype or Urbild of the world as 'child' of God. He is, in Berdyaev's curious phrase, the 'God-world'. Thus any opposition between Christ and the world belongs to the order of appearance, not to that of reality. The 'world' can be an order opposed to Christ: insofar as it is built up on iron laws of nature, and bound together with sin and guilt. But this is not the cosmos in itself, but rather an 'acosmic condition of the spirit'. Christ comes to save, not to condemn, the 'true' world, the cosmos. It is this divine work which the Church exists to continue:

Dasselbe Problem 'Christus und die Welt' ist für Berdiajew ein ekklesiologisches Problem; denn die Kirche ist ja der fortlebende Christus.¹⁶

Having considered the Church as sobornost and as world-soul, it remains for us to note the third fundamental aspect of Berdyaev's ecclesiology which is the Church as Godmanhood. The Church is not simply the supreme realisation of community in the spirit; nor is it simply the union of the cosmos with Christ. It is also - in an echo of Solovyev's thought - the locus of a continuing union of the two natures, divine and human. Although their union is not hypostatic, as in Christ, it is real. The Church is a 'divine-human organism' or 'process' because in her both divine grace and human freedom are activated. The divine side Berdyaev characterises as 'imperturbable holiness, the grace-gifts of the Holy Spirit which do not depend on man':¹⁷ the human side as man's decision-making and creativity. Berdyaev regards the idea of Godmanhood as the key to an understanding of the Church's structure and history. He lays especial weight on the human factor:

The Church does not exist without the human, without human nature, and the human element in the Church is not only an object of the influence of divine grace, but also a subject, an active, free, creative subject which responds to the divine call. In the Church there is continuous movement not only from God to humanity, but also from humanity to God. Through this, the dynamic of the Church's life, its historicity, is determined.¹⁸

'Creativity', tvorčestvo, plays a vital role in Berdyaev's ecclesiology as elsewhere in his thought. The creative act is 'pareschatological', offering a glimpse of a final 'anthropological revelation' of the Holy Spirit in man.¹⁹

But though the Church is a theandric reality, its human

component does not consistently reach great heights of creative response to the divine. Berdyaev speaks therefore of two sub-principles within the human principle at work. He contrasts an aristocratic, mystical 'Johannine' element in the Church with a democratic, institutional, 'Petrine' element. The Petrine element speaks to the great masses who lack, by and large, any intense spiritual aspiration. The Johannine element speaks to a chosen few reminiscent, though Berdyaev hails to notice this, of the 'pneumatics' of Gnosticism and the prophets of Montanism. Concerned for the salvation of the mass, Berdyaev is equally absorbed by the thought of those great creative individuals who have spurned the Church. The distinction between Petrine and Johannine enables him to grant a place in the Church to hoi polloi while at the same time attaching to her those who, without the visible institution, have attained to Godmanhood and so disclose, without knowing it, her inner life.²⁰

By way of conclusion: through his Khomiakovian inheritance, as well as via his own attempted overcoming of the dualism-monism divide, Berdyaev draws a sharp distinction between the Church as a communion of freedom and love and the Church as a hierarchical society. Detaching the idea of freedom from individualism and re-attaching it to the notion of sobornost, Khomiakov, and Berdyaev after him, managed to overcome the limitations of the principle of private judgment in religion. As Berdyaev wrote:

Sobornost signifies a quality of life which affirms the reality of freedom by widening the scope of freedom and by revealing its transcendent, universal dimension. The recognition of the absolute priority of freedom does not,

therefore, denote, as some would like to make out, individualistic self-assertion. Freedom of the spirit has in fact nothing in common with individualism: to be free is not to be insulated; it is not to shut oneself up, but, on the contrary, to break through in a creative act to the fulness and universality of existence.²¹

But at the same time, Berdyaev, like Khomiakov before him, created new difficulties vis-à-vis the traditional understanding of a pastoral magisterium of bishops, possessed of charisma veritatis thanks to the derivation of the episcopate from the apostolic ministry founded by Christ.

Authority is the extreme pole of objectivity, whereas spirit is extreme subjectivity, the very depths of subjectivity. In the sphere of religious or spiritual authority, spirit is abstracted from itself and externalised. Thus spiritual authority is social: it symbolises a humanity which has not yet discovered its essential divinity and which is governed by purely human power-relationships.... In speech and action, authority is represented by popes, assemblies, bishops, social institutions. If any of these were really inspired, then authority would be at an end. A spiritual criterion would do away with criteria as such, with the very problem of criteria. There can be no criterion of spirit, since it is itself a criterion... Spirit leads us in the way of truth.²²

Rejecting, then, any notion of authority that might suffer expression in legal terms, Berdyaev opposed a Rechtskirche to a Liebeskirche, Berdyaev's general tendency being to reject altogether the juridical element in the Church's social existence.²³ There is, indeed, a certain anarchist strain in his thought, a reaction to the two authoritarianisms, Tsarist

and Bolshevist, under which his life in Russia was spent. As he put it, describing the influence upon him of the 'little revolution' of 1905:

The slogan adopted by the mystical anarchists was 'non-acceptance of the world', and they claimed to be the champions of complete freedom of the spirit from all external conditions. I need hardly say that the cause of mystical anarchism was profoundly congenial to me... Freedom, unconditional and uncompromising freedom, has been the fountainhead and prime mover of all my thinking.²⁴

Accordingly, Berdyaev praises the Slavophile theologians for locating sobornost within the realm of freedom, but holds that they did not press their achievement home. The free spirit can no more bow to the collective judgment of an ecclesiastical commune than it can to that of a hierarch or group of hierarchs. While liberalism may be erroneous, libertas is both the tell-tale sign of spirit, and the goal of the theandric design in saving history. Berdyaev's most substantial theological work, Filosofiya Svobodnago Dukha, is not only a major source for his theosophical speculations, inspired by Jakob Böhme, on freedom as Ungrund: a primordial void preceding both Creator and creation and hence impenetrable even to God. It is also the repository of his finest Trinitarian and Christological reflection on the grace of the Son as the illumination of freedom from within.²⁵ In this persistent concern with the motif of freedom Berdyaev shows the influence, deeply rooted in pre-revolutionary Russian life, of the 'concrete Idealism' of F.W.J. von Schelling, though Schelling's concept of freedom has its own properly theological sources.²⁶

This summary of Berdyaev's ecclesiological thinking should suggest a number of points of resemblance to Afanasev's theology. One notes the tendency to define the Church as sobornost, an inter-active receptivity of persons and communities. Again, there is the stress on ecclesial consciousness, sobranie, generated by this sobornost. Afanasev like Berdyaev contrasts institution with koinōnia, regarding a system of legal rights and duties associated with the former as incompatible with the quality of freedom attaching to the latter. 'Spirit', for Berdyaev, 'the Holy Spirit' for Afanasev, are themselves the fundamental criteria for right believing and right acting. Though textual evidence is lacking, it is difficult to resist the ascription of Afanasev's concept of tvorčestvo, 'creativity', to Berdyaev's influence. Finally, Afanasev's most persistent problem, that of the relation of 'mystical' and 'empirical' reality in the Church, echoes, albeit in a staccato and somewhat distorted way, Berdyaev's distinction between 'spirit' and 'object'. Though Afanasev wholly lacked Berdyaev's capacity for sustained ontological and epistemological reflection, his decision to construct an ecclesiology on the foundation of the Eucharist has the effect, and perhaps the intention, of reuniting the spiritual and empirical realms. In this sense, the problem raised for Berdyaev by fundamental anthropology, and echoed in Afanasev's investigations of Councils and canons, finds its resolution in the 'Lord's table', which is both human meal (empirical) and proleptic presence of the eschatological Spirit (spiritual). Afanasev can thus succeed in re-introducing the public life and authority of the Church in a new way: as the expression of the conditions on which the eucharistic assembly

possesses full integrity.

B. Sergei Nikolayevič Bulgakov, 1871-1944

As is well-known, Bulgakov's hermeneutical principle in theology was the idea of sophia, 'wisdom'. This concept he uses not, according to his own apologia, to replace Church teaching but rather to deepen understanding of it.²⁷ The Logos is the uncreated divine Wisdom, but it is also the eternal heavenly 'Man', the humanity of God. Moreover, there is for Bulgakov a further created sophia, pre-existent in relation to the world, neither in time nor outside it, the divinely-given basis of the creation where it appears as form. This second sophia Bulgakov terms 'Church',²⁸ and because of this identification, the Church can be said to be pre-existent and invisible.²⁹ The Church as wisdom and the creation itself are mutually ordered to each other, for the pre-existent Church undergoes its realisation in the creation, whose meaning and ground she is.³⁰ Thus the world is a kind of dynamic incarnation of the Church-sophia.

It (the Church) is the divine ground of the world and the real meaning of human history in which the Church takes possession of the creation until God be all in all.³¹

This cosmic process is called by Bulgakov 'ecclesialisation', otserkovlenie, or, in his German writings, Verkirchlichung. In this process man plays a special part, since the world has been entrusted to his freedom. The svobodnoe upodoblenie, 'free assimilation', to the Image of God asked of Adam and Eve is at the same time the polnoe votserkovlenie, 'plenary ecclesialisation', of their lives and therewith of the life of all creation which

has been entrusted to their care. The Fall knocked man off the put otserkovleniya, the 'way of ecclesialisation', and set him instead on a put obmirščeniya, a 'way of worldlification', if the neologism be permitted. However, this event did not destroy the Church but rather altered the manner of its formation in and through the created order.³²

The Incarnation of the Logos-Sophia becomes the new manner in which the Church is realised in history, though preceded by a degree of 'ecclesialisation' in the Old Testament: predvartiелnoe votserkovlenie, 'preparatory ecclesialisation'. The complete incarnation of God means the complete divinisation of human nature in Christ. With this supreme event, the Church in the narrower sense of the word is founded. In the resurrection Christ's humanity reaches the exalted condition intended for mankind from the beginning, while Pentecost being the descent of the Spirit on the Church is at once the climax of the incarnate life and the disclosure of the Trinitarian character of our divinisation: from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. The Church as now existing is the body of Christ because living with his life:

Das Leben mit Christus wird zum Leben in Christus, das Leben Christi in uns. Hier wiederholt oder verwirklicht sich von neuem das Geheimnis der Einigung zweier Naturen in Christus. Er vereinigt sich nicht nur mit seinem persönlichen Leib der Fleischwerdung, nämlich mit seiner Menschheit, sondern mit jedem Menschen der ihn sucht. In diesem Sinn einer vollkommenen Lebensgemeinschaft mit Christus wird die Kirche im Gotteswort als Leib Christi bezeichnet.³³

The Church is the expression of the humanity of Christ, related

to him as body to soul in an individual man. At the same time, life in Christ must mean life in the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit is not alien to the Son but from him, as from the Father. Thus the Church, in virtue of being Christ's body must also be the vessel of the Holy Spirit.³⁴

In this connexion, Bulgakov speaks of the Church as Christ's body in a two-fold sense. Firstly, the Church is Christ's body as mystery, tayno. After Pentecost Christ is present on earth in an invisible way in the Church through the operation of the Spirit. Secondly, however, the Church is Christ's body as sacrament, tainstvo. Christ 'appears' bodily through the sacraments and especially the Eucharist. This bodily-sacramental presence of Christ is also the work of the Holy Spirit. Bulgakov defends these pneumatological references by reference to the account of the Jerusalem church in the book of the Acts, with the close dependence of that account on the coming of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts, as well as in terms of the liturgical texts of the Slav-Byzantine tradition, where the eucharistic gifts are said to be changed into Christ's presence 'through your Holy Spirit'.³⁵ However, the Church can only be the body of Christ, his humanity, if it unites within itself the natural, human order with the gracious divine order.

Dementsprechend erschliesst und verwirklicht sich dieses Leben in sichtbaren Formen, das Übersinnliche im Sinnlichen. Aber diese Formen sind gegeben und eingesetzt durch den Gottmenschen selber, indem er sein Leben seinem Leib unmittelbar verteilt.

The 'being body' of the Church, then, its communitarian existence, visibility and constitution, are all built on the Church's

gracious share in the being of Christ. Thus life in Christ is only accessible by personal sharing in a corporate reality, being unavailable to the individual as such.

Die Gemeinschaft begnadeten Lebens wird den Menschen nicht individuell, in der Vereinzelung, gegeben, sondern gemeinschaftlich in Verbindung mit der Kirche als gottverordneter Organisation.³⁶

But the appearance of the Church in the narrower sense at Pentecost does not render the invisible Church in the wider sense passé. On the contrary, the whole aim of the ecclesialisation of life wrought by the historic, institutional Church is to reach that point at which the visible and invisible Church will coincide, Sophia and creation become wholly and indivisibly one. Thus it is that God will be all in all.³⁷

Bulgakov, like Berdyaev, picked up Khomiakov's notion of sobornost, except that he frequently prefers the term 'unity', edinstvo, Einheit, or, again, 'wholeness', količestvennoe, Ganzheitlichkeit, or yet again, 'generality', vseobščnost, Allgemeinheit.³⁸ He is perfectly familiar with the quantitative or extensive notion of catholicity which he considers typical of the Catholic Church. He does not by any means wholly reject it, justifying the Slavonic translation of katholiké ekklésia as sobornaja cerkov on the grounds that the Church sobiraet, 'gathers', all peoples on the face of the earth.³⁹ Nevertheless, for Bulgakov, the qualitative sense of catholicity is the primary one. This qualitative, intensive catholicity is defined by him as the 'self-identity of the life of grace', samotožestvennost blagodatnoi žizni.⁴⁰ Elsewhere, he speaks of it in terms of truth: 'katholische Kirche' means 'die in der Wahrheit wesende,

die an der Wahrheit teilnehmende, die ein wahrhaftiges Leben lebende Kirche'. This notion provides Bulgakov with a key to a Sophianic understanding of the Church.

Bei dieser Begriffsbestimmung deutet to kath'holon, d. h. gemäss dem Ganzen, im Ganzen, darauf hin, worin diese Wahrheit, diese Wesenhaftigkeit besteht, und zwar in der Einheit mit dem Ganzen (holon), in der Totalität und Integrität, in der Vielenheit und Alleinheit.... Die Katholizität in diesem Sinn ist die mystische und metaphysische Urtiefe der Kirche und bedeutet nicht einfach bloss äussere Expansion. Sie hat nicht äussere, geographische Merkmale und tritt überhaupt nicht empirisch in Erscheinung.... Doch muss sie mit der empirischen Welt verbunden sein, also mit der 'sichtbaren' Kirche.⁴¹

Yet Bulgakov sees no contradiction between the quantitative and qualitative understandings of catholicity. When one is thinking of the inner unity of the Church, it makes perfectly good sense to say that in the particular church - whether national, local or even domestic - the one Church is fully present, in the self-identity of the life of grace, and the parallel self-identity of truth. Yet when thinking of the unity of the Church throughout the world, one naturally describes such a particular church as simply a part, Častnaya tserkov, Teilkirche. The local church is truly the Church - but only insofar as it endures in relationship with the universal Church. Bulgakov expresses this relation in terms of two metaphors: the drop of water and the ocean, the leaves or branches of a tree and its trunk and root.

Es gibt einen mächtigen, in der Tiefe unermesslichen Strom kirchlichen Überlieferung, in dem die einzelnen Leben zusammenfliessen und in welchem jede Teilgemeinde einmündet. Der ganze Schatz kirchlicher Überlieferung,

den die Kirche durch die Gnade in sich enthält, kann niemals im Rahmen einer kirchlichen Teilerfahrung, Platz haben. Das ist nur auf ihrer allgemeinen Grundlage möglich, wie jeder Wassertropfen in sich den Geschmack und die Feuchtigkeit des ganzen Ozeans besitzt und jedes Blatt auf dem Baum auch durch die Vermittlung des Stammes von der ganzen Wurzel nährt.⁴²

Nevertheless Bulgakov denied that the inter-relation of particular churches could be expressed in juridical form. He rejected a 'unity of power' over the Church and thus found himself unable to accept the claims to primacy of jurisdiction put forward by the Roman see. A mutual recognition in grace and hierarchy, expressed in sacramental communion, conjoins the local churches but leaves them otherwise independent to choose their policies and programmes. Only spiritual relationship, dukhovnaya svyaz, is proper to the Church of Christ, and Bulgakov claimed, at any rate in his study Pravoslavie, that such relationship was realised in the present structure of the Orthodox Church as a communion of autocephalous churches. However, Bulgakov recognised that there might be varying degrees in the realisation of catholicity as between different local churches. This was not a matter of the numerical dimensions of a church but of its 'fidelity to the truth'. It was because of the Roman church's outstanding orthodoxy that the ancient Church recognised in it a primacy of authority, primat avtoriteta, saw it as occupying a 'first rank in authority', pervenstvo avtoriteta. But in no way could or should this be given canonical form.⁴³ Thus Bulgakov's ecclesiology, while standing fundamentally within the line descending from Khomiakov, anchors the concept of sobornost more securely in Christology and soteriology. At

the same time, it provides a theology of the local church absent in the earlier writer.

A reflection of Bulgakov's greater interest, compared with Berdyaev, in the visible structures of Church communities, is his concern with the historical origins and development of those structures. His ideas on the origins of the historic ministry in Pravoslavie have been summed up in this way:

L'organisation de l'Eglise primitive, définie comme charismatique, n'aurait ... pas été anarchique. Bulgakov pense que les charismatiques avaient été remplacés par les episkopoi, qui auraient conservé la plénitude des charismes. Nous aurions donc: les apôtres - les charismatiques, institués par les apôtres - les episkopoi. L'évolution de la structure de l'Eglise se serait effectuée autour de l'Eucharistie. C'était aussi la célébration de l'Eucharistie qui aurait constitué le facteur essentiel de l'évolution ultérieure vers une hiérarchie de trois degrés.⁴⁴

In the important and controverted article, 'Ierarchiya i tainstva' Bulgakov tried to combine this Eucharistic principle with his Khomakovian inheritance.⁴⁵ While not denying that a hierarchical principle has existed in the Church since its very origin, he now insists that sobornost embraces this principle, bearing and generating it while not, however, being its creator tout court. Bulgakov claims, it seems, that in the first two or three decades of the Church's life the sobornost of apostolic consciousness guaranteed a ministerial succession of some kind, a kind not yet that of the threefold ministry.

Seulement deux ou trois décennies après la disparition des Douze, la sobornost serait entrée dans la période du charisme ordonné ou l'on imposait les mains pour conférer un des trois degrés hiérarchiques.⁴⁶

But it must be admitted that on this whole issue Bulgakov lacked Afanasev's historical sense, and his concern to use ancient texts in a patient work of historical reconstruction.

The influence of Bulgakov on Afanasev's development was indicated by Marianne Afanaseva in her 'La Génèse de L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit'.⁴⁷ She singled out in particular Bulgakov's notion of the 'ecclesialisation of life', otserkovlenie žizni, and his vision of the Eucharist. And though Afanasev's own comments on his relations with Bulgakov in the Schultze-Afanasev letters suggest his debt to the older man was more one of a personal model in the theological enterprise than specific theological ideas, his writings advert explicitly to Bulgakov's ecclesiological work on a number of occasions.⁴⁸ It is striking how Afanasev shares with Berdyaev a number of major themes: not only the wellnigh ubiquitous Russian sobornost motif, but also the idea of the Church's foundation in the bodily-sacramental being of Christ in the Eucharist, as achieved through the Holy Spirit; the contrast of quantitative, or in Afanasev's term 'Cyprianic', universality, with its qualitative 'Ignatian', counterpart; the relation of local church to Church universal; the concept of degrees of catholicity, moderated by hostility to a canonically expressed primacy; the conviction that the genesis of the ordained ministry must be sought in a relation to the Eucharistic celebration. But in Afanasev, the sophianic element in Bulgakov's ecclesiology virtually disappears, as does the 'invisible Church' of Khomiakov. Afanasev renounces the attempt to seek a metaphysical principle of becoming for the Church of this world - though this is not to say that his ecclesiology wholly lacks philosophical presuppositions. Furthermore, by

eliminating Bulgakov's consideration of Christ's 'spiritual' as well as 'sacramental' presence in the Church, Afanasev removes the foundation for a theology of the one Church as distinct from the local church, converting Bulgakov's portrait of the local church as pars pro toto into a simple totum. For Bulgakov, as for Khomiakov earlier, the criterion for catholicity is the possession of the fulness of truth - something brought about in the Church by the Spirit of Christ. Whereas, as Plank penetratingly remarks:

In Afanas'ev's Katholizitäts-Vorstellung spielt dieses Kriterium kaum eine Rolle, da bei ihm die Anwesenheit Christi im Geiste nicht zur Geltung kommt. Er stellt nicht die Frage, ob die Fülle der Wahrheit, der gesamte Strom kirchlicher Überlieferung, in einer einzigen Ortsgemeinde vorhanden sein kann, sondern bestreitet a priori jede wie immer geartete überörtliche Katholizität. Die bedingte Katholizität der Ortskirche bei Bulgakov wird so aufgrund der anders gearteten Vorstellung von der Anwesenheit Christi in seiner Kirche bei Afanas'ev zur Absoluten.⁴⁹

Yet in both writers the rejection of canonical relationship, and so of jurisdictional primacy among the churches is made on the same grounds and in the same tone of vigorous disapproval, even though their terminology differs, Bulgakov speaking of dukhovnaya svyaz, Afanasev of soyuz lyubvi, the 'union of love'. Moreover, Afanasev will eventually make his way towards a recognition of a variety of degrees in the inner authority of local churches, based on the varying weight of their witness to faith, something which for him is ultimately founded upon divine election. Both theologians recognise therefore a primatial role for a particular church, a role which in the primitive age of Christianity belonged

to the church of the city of Rome. Only the primacy in question cannot be expressed legally in a Rechtsinstanz; rather, it shows itself in a non-coercive responsibility, dependent on no other power than the Spirit of God. Yet in the last resort, a comparison of Bulgakov with Afanasev, while showing the consonances between the latter and his older contemporaries in the Russian tradition, also draws our attention to a certain narrowing of that tradition in Afanasev's work. The selection of the theme of Christ's eucharistic presence in the Church as the key to reflection on her mystery leads to a radically eucharistic ecclesiology with a clarity all its own. But the relative inattention to other aspects of the Christ's indwelling in the Church, closing off the way as it does to a theology of the universal Church, produces a certain impoverishment in the picture of the local church itself.

C. George Vasilevič Florovsky, 1893-1977

Florovsky's theological programme differed markedly from those of Berdyaev and Bulgakov. His principal aim was patristic ressourcement. The consonance of this programme with that of Afanasev warrants consideration of how it was arrived at. It was by way of reaction to his own earlier intellectual enthusiasms that Florovsky proposed to go back, behind the Russian theology of the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, to the pure spirit of the Greek fathers and classical Byzantine theology. As a student, and then lecturer, in philosophy at Odessa in the years of the Great War and its immediate aftermath, he had been a neo-Kantian with Husserlian interests. Subsequently he rejected

Idealism in all its forms, regarding it as having undermined Russian theological culture. In the early years of his exile in Bulgaria, he had attached himself to the so-called 'Eurasian' group which centred on the figure of Prince Nicolas Trubetskoy. A deviation from Slavophilism, this party held that the culture and spirituality of the Russian people derived from a unique synthesis of the most original element in Europe, the Slavs, with the most dynamic element in Asia, the Tartars. Again, he also came to reject this type of speculation as both ill-grounded and lacking in specifically Christian content. After receiving the chair of patrology at Saint-Serge in 1925 he moved away from Bulgakov (and from Berdyaev), regarding their sophiological interests as a combination of Neo-Platonism and German Idealism foreign to the spirit of the Gospel. An article in Kyrios for 1937 accused the Russian theologians of betraying the Eastern tradition, and led to the bad feeling at Saint-Serge which eventually prompted him to move to the United States.⁵⁰ Although Florovsky's scholarly grasp of the Greek and Byzantine sources far exceeded that of his colleagues - as witness his two major studies, Vostochnye Ottsy IV veka, and Vizantiiskie Ottsy V-VIII vekov - he did in fact retain several features of their shared Russian theological inheritance.⁵¹ In the first place, the concept of sobornost preserved its primacy. In the second place, Florovsky's concern with what the Fathers and mediaevals actually said was not a novelty in the Russian church, but an act of attachment to a particular element in its nineteenth century academic tradition. Finally, Florovsky shared the ecumenical interests of the Saint-Serge group, interests which were themselves a natural reaction to the situation of the Russian diaspora in

the West.

The central theme of Florovsky's ecclesiology is that of the catholicity of the Church: his own version of the Russian commonplace, sobornost. The motif is first announced in his essay, 'Sobornost: the catholicity of the Church', a contribution to an Anglo-Russian symposium on ecclesiology held in London in 1934.⁵² In this study, Florovsky describes the victory of Christ, realised in the Paschal mystery, as manifesting itself to the world on the day of Pentecost by means of the birth of the Church. This new community of the Spirit, itself the living body of Christ on earth, constitutes the active nucleus of the new creation. It is where man's salvation - that is, his divinisation - is realised. The catholic unity of the Church, sobornost, begins and ends with the regeneration of the redeemed in Christ and the Spirit. This catholicity is most fully expressed and realised in the Eucharist as sacrament of the Body of Christ and 'place' of the Holy Spirit. Within this compressed, synthetic statement, Florovsky finds room for his most important ecclesiological ideas - not simply sobornost or 'qualitative catholicity', but also his idea of tradition as a charismatic moment of unveiling and transmitting the divine truth which exists at the heart of the Church's life.

Florovsky's journey to Athens for the first ever pan-Orthodox theological congress in 1936 convinced him of the rightness of his general programme. His themes at the congress were, negatively, a denunciation of the 'pseudo-morphoses' that Russian theology had undergone as a result of Latin and Protestant influence, and, positively, the need to re-hellenise Orthodoxy.⁵³ After the Second World War he was able to return

to his ecclesiological concerns in a new ecumenical setting: that of the Amsterdam assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1948. For this he prepared two papers which constitute the essence of his mature thinking on the Church.⁵⁴ Before outlining the substance of these two essays, it seems worth noting the nature of Florovsky's critique of the concept of a 'World Council of Churches', which he never ceased to make even while accepting invitations to assist and participating vigorously in theological debate thereat. Florovsky insisted that the World Council was not an ecclesial reality, and therefore not a possible locus for a new Pentecost of the mystical body. His reasons involve an aspect of his ecclesiology of comparable importance in the work of Afanasev. The touchstone of 'ecclesiality', according to Florovsky, is incorporation into Christ, and this is specifically achieved through eucharistic communion. Baptismal incorporation (and the consequent 'inchoative' regeneration) was not sufficient in his eyes to constitute the Church in her total truth. Thus the 'communion of baptism' (i.e. common baptismal initiation) could not of itself provide a basis for ecclesial unity. Only in the Eucharist is the Church in its integral state disclosed both to the Church itself and to others, that integral state being the new creation of man in the body of Christ as new Adam.⁵⁵

In his 'Amsterdam essays' Florovsky gave a good deal of thought to questions of method when approaching ecclesiology. Some few years earlier a Catholic writer, M.D. Koster, had claimed that ecclesiology was still in a 'pre-theological' phase.⁵⁶ Florovsky regarded this as an excessive statement: the fathers certainly had a vision of the Church even if they

lacked a clearly worked out conceptuality for the Church. But the very lack of a 'global' and reasoned account of patristic ecclesiology did make it hard to 'place' the doctrine of the Church within the tradition at large, and so within a theological system. The main weakness of ecclesiology hitherto, he suggested, was its status as an isolated block, unintegrated with the rest of the Orthodox dogmas. Over the last century, liturgical and devotional experience has led to a rediscovery of the corporate, organic character of the Christian life, and of the existential value, then, of the Church. But because the life of the Church is in fact the existential presupposition of all theology, the Church itself has not yet been much theologised as a distinct object.⁵⁷ 'On ne définit pas ce qui est absolument évident de soi'. Only with the Protestant Reform did the Church really become a contested question. The first attempts to define the Church's mystery after that great break wanted to rationalise the traditional vision and so narrowed it unacceptably. In addition, they were too scarred by their origin in inter-confessional polemics. The definitions of nineteenth century Russian ecclesiology belong, Florovsky opines, more to the Church's schools than to the Church herself. But now Florovsky proposes to seek a new definition of the Church's essence by withdrawing from the classroom to the liturgical assembly:

Si nous nous proposons d'aller au-delà des discussions et les controverses modernes pour retrouver une perspective historique plus large, sinon véritablement universelle (quod semper, ubique et ab omnibus creditum est!), pour découvrir à nouveau le véritable 'esprit catholique', c'est-à-dire intégral, qui voudrait embrasser l'ensemble de l'expérience acquise par

l'Eglise dans son pèlerinage à travers les âges. Il faut aussi revenir de la salle de classe au temple, à l'Église qui adore et prie (die betende Kirche!) et qui rend témoignage de sa foi et de son espérance. Et peut-être faudrait-il encore remplacer le vocabulaire scolastique de la théologie par le langage métaphorique et symbolique de la dévotion, qui est aussi celui de l'Écriture Sainte.

And Florovsky concludes this appeal for a symbolic ecclesiology founded on liturgical experience with the words:

La vraie nature de l'Église peut-être plus dépeinte et décrite que proprement définie. Ce qui ne peut certainement être accompli que du dedans de l'Église. Et même cette description convaincra probablement que ceux qui sont de l'Église. Le mystère n'est jamais saisi que par la foi.⁵⁸

According to the principal interpreter of Florovsky's ecclesiology, Yves-Noël Lelouvier, Florovsky found himself attracted by two possible approaches, each of which could claim the support of Scripture and Tradition. They were, respectively, christocentric and pneumatocentric. Lelouvier points out that these approaches are as approaches mutually exclusive: one cannot have an ecclesiology which is worked out primarily in terms of the Son, and at the same time primarily in terms of the Spirit. As yet, he remarks, we have not found the middle term which might enable a true synthesis here. Florovsky opted in fact for the christological approach, believing this to be the major approach in the entire tradition from Augustine to Cabasilas. Subsequently, in the modern period ecclesiology became so 'sociological' in nature that it presented the Church more as a body of believers than as the Body of Christ. Since Christ and the Spirit cannot be separated, the christological type of ecclesiology is open to a pneumatological 'reading' -

and this is useful since pneumatology itself is so little developed in the Church (because, Florovsky thinks, of the quite inappropriate weight given to the Filioque controversy both by East and West). On the other hand, such efforts as have been made to pursue a pneumatological type of ecclesiology, such as Johann Adam Möhler's in his Die Einheit der Kirche, have not been auspicious. The christological element in them is definitely damaged, as also happened with Khomiakov. At an extreme, the doctrine of the Church in a pneumatological setting returns to being a sociology by a fresh route: it becomes a kind of charismatic sociology. Concretely, the question is, Do we set out in ecclesiology from the fact of koinōnia, the phenomenon of the Church as communion, or from Christ as God made man, thereby seeking out the ecclesiological implications of the mysteries of the incarnation, atonement and glorification? Of course there can be no contradiction between Paul's en Pneumati and his en Christō, but we must know to which we will give methodological priority. Florovsky believes that the en Pneumati is definitely subordinate to and subsequent to the en Christō:

Our unity in the Spirit is precisely our incorporation in Christ which is the ultimate reality of Christian existence.

While admitting that many images can have a rightful place in ecclesiology, Florovsky held that the central image of the Christian Church must be that of the 'body of Christ': no other has the inclusive, synthesising, englobing value of this. For the essential presupposition of the existence of the Church is that new, intimate unity between God and man brought about by the incarnation. Christ as the God-man is the living place

of encounter between the divine love offering salvation and sinful man accepting that gift. The identification of Christ with mankind is consummated in his death, his victory over the powers of destruction. The paschal mystery, the manifestation of the love of God for man is henceforth found as the Church, insofar as the Church shares in the energy of that saving mystery. The Church is, therefore, the continued presence of the Redeemer in the world, as the head in his body.⁵⁹

Florovsky insisted, with his fellow 'néo-patrologue' Vladimir Lossky in mind, that this presentation of the Church as essentially the body of Christ in no way undervalues the role of the Spirit in the Church. The Spirit is the Spirit of the Son as well as of the Father. Lossky's scheme in La théologie mystique de l'Eglise d'Orient suffers from the perennial vice of all analysts: the absolute separation of constitutive elements. For Lossky, the body of Christ is the static aspect of the mystery of the Church, while her dynamic aspect is found in her being as communion in the Holy Spirit.⁶⁰ Yet, Florovsky points out, this dichotomy would withdraw from Christ his operation in his own body. Florovsky's ecclesiology thus rejoins, from an Orthodox perspective, the Western ecclesiology of the corpus Christi mysticum which, through the researches of Père Emil Mersch into patristic and mediaeval sources enjoyed a marked renaissance in the inter-war years in Catholic circles.

It is possible, as Peter Plank has suggested, that Florovsky's account of the relation of the Church and the Eucharist played a part in Afanasev's own development.⁶¹ That account is to be found most notably in an essay of 1929 entitled 'Evkharistiya i Sobornost',⁶² which points out the close inter-connectedness

of the concepts of Eucharist, Body of Christ, Church and unity in Christian use. Through the Eucharist, believers become the body of Christ: therefore, the Eucharist is a mystērion synaxēos, a 'sacrament of assembly', or again, mystērion koinōnias, 'sacrament of community'. The unity which belongs to the Eucharistic fellowship is not merely spiritual or moral, nor is it simply experiential, a unity of aspiration and feeling. Rather it is real and ontological, the realisation of the single organic life in Christ. And Florovsky speaks of the Eucharistic assembly as the 'fulness and summit' of the Church's unity. Naturally, this raises the question whether the essence of the Church may not be found, then, in the local church, in such a way that structures transcending that local church be deemed in the last analysis inessential to the Church's life. Florovsky gives to this question an answer subtly different from that of Afanasev:

In the Eucharist there is unveiled, invisibly but really, the fulness of the Church. Each Liturgy is celebrated in union with the whole Church, so vseyu Tserkoviyu and, so to speak, in its name, ot eya litsa not just in the name of those who are present. For every ... little Church, malaya Tserkov, is not only a part, čast, but a comprehensive image, styažennyi obraz, of the whole Church, inseparable from its unity and fulness. Therefore in each liturgy the whole Church is present and takes part - mysteriously but really. The liturgical celebration is in a certain sense a renewed incarnation of God. In it we glimpse the God-man, Christ, as founder and head of the Church - and with him the whole Church. In the prayer of the Eucharist the Church sees and acknowledges herself as the single and complete Body of Christ.⁶³

This passage displays both close resemblances to Afanasev's

thought and substantial differences. For both, it is the eucharistic body of Christ which enables men to become his ecclesial body. And only the local church can celebrate the Eucharist. But whereas Afanasev draws from this the conclusion that the local church is, so to speak, the whole Church in the whole, Florovsky believes that that church is simply the whole in the part. As Plank puts it:

Da Christus, das Haupt der Kirche, in der eucharistischen feiernden Gemeinde ganz gegenwärtig ist, muss mit ihm die ganze Kirche gegenwärtig sein, in ihrer qualitativen Fülle und in ihrer quantitativen Ausdehnung.⁶⁴

Florovsky's ecclesiology, in other words, unrepentantly retains a 'universal' dimension, despite his concern that due theological weight should be given to the Ortskirche and its eucharistic life. Nevertheless, this essay, and in general, Florovsky's stress on the sacramentality of the Church as the extension of Christ's body, is yet more evidence that Afanasev's own ecclesiology does not stand alone in the theological culture of Russian Orthodoxy in the present century.

^

Appendix B The classification of Afanasev's ecclesiology

Ecclesiology is an area of theology where positive, factual considerations play a large part: for instance, matters of Church history and order, the structure of sacramental rites seen as manifestations of the Church's nature, the evidence of liturgies and the corpora of canon law. But it should not be thought that ecclesiology is wholly deprived of a speculative element, or of first principles whose description may vary from author to author. A characteristic feature of contemporary reflection in this domain is the attempt to organise ecclesiological systems, or portraits of the Church, according to a classificatory scheme. Where would the work of Afanasev be placed, were such attempts extended so as to include his writing? As a preliminary to answering this question, it may be helpful to indicate more concretely what is meant by the phrase 'classificatory scheme'. In ecclesiology, as elsewhere in theology, such a scheme may be either philosophical or theological in character. We must, then, take each in turn.

i. A philosophical scheme

Philosophical 'models' are active in ecclesiology as intellectual infrastructures. Such infrastructures consist of principles which claim to throw light on the nature of reality, ordering at the most fundamental level what is held to be the case. They have their source in the ontological framework of real, in re, and mental, in intellectu, relationships within which human life is set. No human existence

lacks a basic ontology, for no culture is deprived of patterns of consciousness that offer a 'reading' of being. The Church, in her historical self-realisation, uses philosophical forms of thought and expression in the task of grasping and communicating her own intelligibility. But in utilising such philosophical forms, the Church is also obliged by fidelity to the Gospel as the Word of God to submit them to a critique in the light of the economies of the Son and the Holy Spirit. They cannot, therefore, play such a determinative role as the principles, models or forms found within a theological classificatory scheme, for these originate from clues found within the Christian revelation itself. Since our aim here is to contextualise Afanasev's thought and not to offer an overview of the ecclesiological tradition as a whole, what follows should not be regarded as an exhaustive survey. Nevertheless, it may be suggested that five main philosophical models can be identified in historic, and contemporary, reflection on the Church.¹

1. The Neo-Platonic model. In Christian use, the Plotinian or Proclean account of emanations from the fount of being, the One, could provide a conceptuality for the Church as illuminating hierarchy. The ladder of the divine and angelic orders, the 'celestial hierarchy', finds its terrestrial counterpart not only in general ontology but also in ecclesiology. The higher fashions the lower, its goodness diffusing itself in order to do so. Unity begets diversity, and the resultant community of differentiation finds its goal in a return to the One. In Denys, our deification is begun, continued and brought to its completion by the Church's sacramental mysteries. Baptism and Eucharist constitute the essential means of this process, and the Church's ministry

is differentiated by its various relations with them, the entire interflow of grace forming an 'ecclesiastical hierarchy'.² Introduced into the West in the ninth century, Denys' works enjoyed high favour with the Victorine and Porretan schools in early Scholasticism, while their providential re-translation around 1240 coincided with the theological activity of the principal high Scholastics.³ Drawing on Denys' Neo-Platonist inheritance, authors influenced by him see the earthly Church as exemplified in the heavenly, and instantiating the principle that human beings are drawn to God through a process of mediation.⁴ However, Denys' notion that, since intermediaries can only enlighten if they are themselves illumined, sacramental absolution must depend on holiness, proved unacceptable in the Latin West, though taken up at times in the Byzantine East.⁵ An interesting development was the use of the model to throw light on the Petrine ministry of the Roman bishop, regarded as the reflection of Christ as primus hierarcha. Such a theology of the primacy derives from Franciscan circles in both Oxford and Paris where Dionysian influences were widespread.⁶ The most serious drawback of this infrastructure lies in its tendency to present the reception of ministry as a passive affair.

2. The Aristotelian model. Despite the indebtedness of historic Scholasticism to Aristotle this model is surprisingly little drawn on in ecclesiological aspects of Scholastic writing.⁷ However, it is found in a flourishing state in the Roman school of the mid-nineteenth century, as in its Neo-Scholastic successors. Aristotelean analysis of reality begins by identifying formal and material elements in the concrete order. It then considers other consequent dimensions summed up in the fourfold causal account of things which the Physics deems needful for

a veridical knowledge of what is real.⁸ Since in Aristoteleanism, metaphysical understanding derives from empirical study, the Aristotelean model in ecclesiology stresses the visibility of the Church, as well as its knowability or susceptibility to encapsulation in language. The nature of an Aristotelean infrastructure in ecclesiology may vary considerably. In the work of the Roman theologian Giovanni Perrone, the Church is compared with an organism which is itself a body-soul unity.⁹ More commonly, Neo-Scholastic ecclesiology will suppose that to know the Church is to understand her causes. Thus Charles Journet attempted to relate the fourfold Aristotelean causality to the four 'marks' of the Church found in the creed of Nicaea-Constantinople. So Journet sees the apostolicity of the Church as bound up with her efficient cause, the apostolic ministry with its sacramental and jurisdictional powers. He regards the formal cause of the Church as Christ the Head, and her material cause as the human members who form his Body. From the former the Church derives her unity, from the latter her catholicity. Finally, Journet deals with the final cause, or end, of the Church, which may be thought of in two ways: either as her 'separated' common good, and this is God, or as her 'immanent' common good, and this is her inner order, from which the fourth mark of the Church, holiness, derives.¹⁰ The danger here is, plainly, a drive to system which may distort the mysterious donnée of a theological subject.

3. The Idealist model. Here the Church is thought of in terms of, or in relation to, the Idealist concept of subject or subjectivity. The Church is the self-expression of the divine Subject in His incarnate form. Furthermore, the intrinsic mystery of the Church's own (derived)

subjecthood is unfolded and expressed in her corporate life across space and through time. The influence of F.W.J. von Schelling and G.W.F. Hegel on the Tübingen school accounts for the presence of such notions in the work of Johann Adam Möhler. At the same time we find cognate notions, the developing expression of the Church's 'idea', in John Henry Newman.¹¹ In the twentieth century, Möhler's account of the Church may be said to re-emerge in Y.M.-J. Congar's portrayal of the Church as Tradition, as also, and with a more marked philosophical emphasis, in Karl Rahner's ecclesiological essays.¹² Rahner sees the Church as the enduring promulgation of God's presence in Christ. Her self-expression takes place in historically conditioned ways, manifested with greater or lesser intensity, as must be the case with any community which depends on the geistlich, and therefore free, reality of persons. For Rahner, the Church's life is Entfaltung: the unfolding self-disclosure and so development of a corporate subject grounded in the Spirit of God but possessing its own transcendence in the Idealist sense: that is, containing structures determinative of its own life and future realisation. The Church never fully actualises her nature, however, at any moment within historical time, being ordered to the eschatological realisation of her own inter-subjectivity. The apostolic ministry is not considered so much as hierarchical illumination or causal formation, but as an aspect of the total process of the community's unfolding. The weakness of this model may be said to lie in its subordination of genetic moment, the Church's apostolic beginnings, to subsequent evolution. But this weakness is especially characteristic of the Idealist model when the principal philosophical inspiration is that of Hegel, with his 'ascending' system in which absolute Mind is the result rather than the

presupposition of the history of being. With the later Schelling's 'descending' schema, the so-called 'positive philosophy', this weakness would not be present.

4. The Phenomenological model. On this model no attempt is made to capture directly the essence of the Church. Rather, that essence is regarded as appearing obliquely in a cluster of ever-changing forms. Here the truth of the Church unveils itself in history, but not in a evolutionistic sense. The model of truth appealed to is reminiscent of Martin Heidegger's Vom Wesen der Wahrheit: the alētheia or 'revealing' which never lacks a corresponding hiddenness and concealment.¹³ Full reality is never apprehended, for to disclose one facet may well be to conceal another. Being and truth are not known apart from cultural history, with its loss and gain in the entertaining of meaning, but in it and through it. Hans Küng's ecclesiology represents theologically such a phenomenology of the history of being.¹⁴ Here the stress on the historical diversity in perceiving the Church is welcome, as is the rejection of a naïve evolutionism. But the danger is that the constants, or fundamental contours, of the Church's life may be neglected, so that the very phenomenon we are to study becomes hard to identify. It is perhaps consonant with this that in Küng's later ecclesiology the Roman Catholic Church ceases to hold a privileged place in determining the subject-matter of a professedly Roman Catholic ecclesiology.

5. The Marxist model. In the Marxian model underlying the 'theology of liberation', the Church is considered as the proleptic form of a new and definitively human society.¹⁵ As humanity struggles through the historical process to achieve a final overcoming of its self-estrangement, regarded in the Christian context as alienation from the

divine image, so the Church is the anticipatory realisation of this truly human state of affairs. Moreover, the Church is the bearer throughout history of the hope that what has been achieved microcosmically in the Christian community, at least at times and in places, may be achieved macrocosmically for the entire human race. This model has the weakness that, insofar as it sees the Church as bearer and exemplar of a state of things itself naturally predictable, through a correct interpretation of the dialectical contradictions of the historical process, it is in danger of reducing the Church from a theological mystery to a sociological desideratum. However, as this brief account of philosophical models in ecclesiology should suggest, the use of philosophy in theology is always attended by the difficulties which stem from the heterogeneity of natural and supernatural reality.

Where in such a classificatory scheme may Afanasev's own ecclesiology be placed? It may be suggested that such philosophical presuppositions as can be disengaged from his writing are closest to those of the Idealist model in its Schellengian form. This is at its most clear in his remarkable stress upon the concept of freedom. Upon this turns his contrast between, on the one hand, the true reality of the Church as agapē and, on the other, the régime of law, conceived in his mature thought as alien to and incompatible with the nature of the Church. Nor are these Schellengian undertones by chance. The contrast between the caritative and juridical in Russian ecclesiology from the time of A.S. Khomiakov onwards represents, as we have had occasion to note in Chapter I, a subterranean influence of Schelling's philosophy in the Russian intellectual tradition.¹⁶ Agapē is defined over against law because it is seen in terms of freedom. Schelling,

indeed, possessed a concept of law and the State which he believed compatible with his 'system of freedom', but this concept was, to use Sir Peter Strawson's distinction, of a 'revisionary' rather than a 'descriptive' kind. That is, it was not an attempt to under-write the positive law of actually existing States, but a proposal for a new form of State, ultimately for a world-State. In the non-Schellingian State law may be deemed to be inseparable from coercion and thus opposed to freedom. Thus the pregnant juxtaposition of the ideas of freedom, unity and love in Afanasev's more speculative writing, and above all in the closing chapter of Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo, at once suggests Schelling's anthropology. The central assertion is that the freedom and unity of many persons can only be combined on the basis of love for the same absolute value. The Church, in Afanasev's eyes, is precisely such a combination, and it is in this way that it realises in history the essence of spiritual being. Though for Afanasev the Church succeeds in this project only through the supernatural effusion of the Holy Spirit which took place at Pentecost, the terms in which this strictly theological mystery are set forth are highly reminiscent of the Schellingian picture of the Absolute as infinite Freedom, communicating itself in the actualisation of a series of finite freedoms. Whilst Afanasev himself betrays little if any interest in philosophy, the strong dose of Schellingianism imbibed by the Russian Slavophiles and especially noteworthy in Afanasev's elder contemporary N.A. Berdyaev explains the presence of this model in his own work.

The identification of such a philosophical sub-structure is not of course to be considered a negative criticism of Afanasev's work. All theologies must carry some philosophical baggage with them, or else they

will not travel far. What is crucial is whether the theologian concerned is aware of his philosophical predilections, and ready to temper them in the light of revelation. It would be difficult, in point of fact, to show that Afanasev was reflectively aware of his philosophical inheritance, via that moderate Slavophilism which, after the revolution of 1917, became virtually de rigueur in the Russian Orthodoxy of the Diaspora. But nevertheless we find in his work a re-thinking of the idea of true community as a communion of free spirits joined by love of the same Absolute, that is, of the Schellengian picture of human society. The re-thinking takes place by means of sustained reference to the celebration of the Eucharist as the central manifestation of the Church's life. Though Afanasev sees in the Eucharist the supreme instance of human communion he also regards it as unthinkable apart from the will of the historical Jesus Christ and the inflowing of his Spirit. Thus a theological element is of necessity injected into the philosophical body. Since the Absolute is the God of Jesus Christ, the values in which the Absolute is reflected are those of kenotic, crucified love, drawn from the historical career of Jesus of Nazareth. Thus the unity-in-freedom of the group is ultimately understood in terms of Christian revelation and not simply in terms of a pre-understanding of that revelation made possible by reason. Though the way in which Afanasev expresses what he has to say is coloured by German Idealism, its content is drawn from the Last Supper seen as the icon of Calvary, and from the event of Pentecost regarded as the effect in the world of the redemptive victory won on the Cross.

Excursus on F.W.J. Schelling's philosophy

The principal feature of Schelling's philosophy is its grounding in a perception of the Absolute conceived as infinite freedom. Father Frederick Copleston has drawn attention to the unity in diversity of Schelling's work which he describes as

a restless process of reflection moving from the ego philosophy of Fichte through the philosophy of nature and of art to the philosophy of the religious consciousness and a form of speculative theism, the whole being linked together by the theme of the relation between the finite and the infinite.¹⁷

Schelling's most characteristic statement of the relation between finite and infinite, at all stages in his development, is in terms of freedom, so much so that his writing has been termed by one modern student a 'system of freedom'.¹⁸ As early as the 1794 essay Über die Möglichkeit einer Form der Philosophie überhaupt, written when he was nineteen, we find Schelling arguing that philosophy must be founded on a single fundamental proposition which will express what is unconditioned in both being and thought.¹⁹ Schelling identifies this unconditioned as the absolute self-positing I, describing it in terms of an infinite freedom apprehensible only in intellectual intuition. He insists that one cannot legitimately argue why the infinite must manifest itself in the finite, for this would be to project anthropomorphic conceptions onto the transcendent. Nor can one move from the finite to the infinite for this would be to ape the a posteriori proofs of God's existence which, in Schelling's view, Kant had discredited. Instead, one must suppress a false problematic by seeing the finite in the infinite and the infinite in the finite. This is achieved in intellectual intuition

which can disclose an identity between the self and the absolute

Subject conceived, once again, as pure free activity: thus the 1795

study whose title resumes Schelling's conclusions so far: Vom Ich als

Prinzip der Philosophie oder über das Unbedingte im menschlichen

Wissen.²⁰ From this fundamental ontology, seized in a single intuition

and expressed in a single proposition, variously stated as 'I is I',

'I am I', or 'I am', Schelling deduces certain anthropological

consequences. Essentially, he supposes that it follows from the

definition of the individual ego as a finite-freedom-in-relation-to-

infinite-Freedom that the human being must devote his life to realising

the Absolute in himself through constant free activity.²¹

In his writings on the philosophy of nature from the period 1797 to 1799, Schelling attempts to develop a cosmology consonant with his account of freedom as the root concept for describing reality. He aims to show that objective nature is a unified dynamic, teleological system which develops upwards to the point where it returns upon itself in and through the human spirit. From this it follows that there is no reality which is alien or external to human understanding. The life of representation is nature's knowledge of itself. In the Absolute, subjectivity and objectivity are one, and this supreme unity is reflected in the way that nature interacts with nature's self-knowledge in and through man.²² In 1800 Schelling produced his System des

transcendental Idealismus which forms the summit of his 'early' philosophy.

Although at first sight this system appears to be a return to his earlier starting-point, Schelling saw the attempt to unfold the complex structure of human consciousness from the idea of the ego as complementary to the truths he had worked out in his philosophy of nature. If the Absolute is the identity of subjectivity and objectivity then it must be possible,

as Copleston points out, to develop a philosophy from one of these two poles compatibly with a philosophy deriving from the other.

Either we can start with the objective and proceed towards the subjective, asking how unconscious nature comes to be represented. Or we can start with the subjective and proceed toward the objective, asking how nature develops the conditions for its own self-reflection on the subjective level.²³

While the philosophy of nature shows how nature develops the conditions for its own self-reflection on the subjective level, the system of transcendental idealism demonstrates how the ultimate immanent principle of consciousness produces the objective world as the condition of its attaining of self-consciousness. And here too, in the system of transcendental idealism, we find the theme of freedom well to the fore. Perhaps the most crucial moment in the elaboration of distinctively human consciousness for Schelling is the moment when the ego, by what Schelling terms an act of 'absolute abstraction', reflectively differentiates itself from the non-ego and recognises itself as a mind, as intelligence, thus becoming for the first time an object for itself. According to Schelling, this moment is only explicable as an act of self-determining will. Thus, concomitant with my discovery of myself as mind, comes a self-discovery as an active and free power.²⁴ This sets the stage for the practical part of the system of transcendental idealism which is concerned with ethical striving.

Schelling sees the self-expression of the ego as will taking place within a movement towards the actualisation in history of a universal moral order. The rational State is one which by its activity assists the harmonious realisation of freedom by a multitude of individuals. In this way, history can be called the revelation of the Absolute. In

order to reconcile the teleological goal of history with human freedom, Schelling has recourse to the idea of an 'absolute synthesis of free actions', whose working out is the necessary expression of the Absolute's own nature as the pure identity of ideal and real. In terms of experience, this identity of real and ideal is discoverable for Schelling in the phenomenon of the artwork, but Schelling's aesthetics, though forming the third part of the system of transcendental idealism, would take us too far from our centre of interest to be investigated here. It may simply be noted that, throughout this phase of his writing and up to, at the earliest the 1801 treatise Darstellung meines Systems, it is not really correct to speak of his Absolute in personal terms. He describes it rather as the 'indifference', that is, the lack of difference, between the ideal and the real, subjectivity and objectivity. The Absolute manifests itself in two series of Potenzen, 'potencies', one series real and considered in the philosophy of nature, the other ideal and dealt with under the rubric of transcendental idealism. The two series taken together constitute everything that is, in other words the ultimate ground of the world. If, however, we try to transcend the standpoint of the empirical consciousness for which distinctions within the world exist and come at the Absolute as it is in itself, then all we can say is that it is the vanishing-point of all difference and distinction.²⁵ Though in this case the concept of the Absolute lacks positive content, this is because by conceptual thought we can only apprehend the Erscheinung, 'appearance', of the Absolute as it externalises itself in the world, and not what it is in itself.

But in his later philosophy Schelling came to conceptualise the ultimate reality in a different way, highlighting from a fresh angle the centrality of the notion of freedom in his work. In place of thinking

of the Absolute as absolute Idea or infinite concept, Schelling came in his 'positive philosophy' to consider it as the source of existence.²⁶ In the creative act, the self-identity of the Absolute becomes differentiated on the level of phenomena, thought not as it is in itself. Because this movement towards multiplicity is centrifugal, Schelling speaks of it as a cosmic fall, as well as an act of creation. But there is also the possibility of a centripetal movement, back to God. This takes place through the transformation of the real into the ideal, of objectivity into subjectivity, in and through the human ego which alone is capable of seeing the Infinite in the finite, and so of referring all images of the divine embedded in phenomena to their Exemplar: thus the 1804 study, Philosophie und Religion.²⁷ In the Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit of 1809 Schelling defended himself against the charge that his scheme was basically pantheistic and so hostile to the very concept of freedom he had earlier emphasised. Schelling now re-interpreted the principle of identity, arguing that God and the world are identical in the sense that God is antecedent, the world consequent. In other words, there came into play the relation of subject and predicate in a statement as the paradigm case of the identity principle.²⁸ Human freedom is not denied by that principle, since in itself the principle says nothing about the content of antecedent and consequent. If in fact God is free then the human spirit which is his image is free. And indeed:

So wenig widerspricht sich Immanenz in Gott und Freiheit,
dass gerade nur das Freie, und soweit es frei ist, in Gott
ist, das Unfreie, und soweit es unfrei ist, nothwendig ausser
Gott.²⁹

But of what nature is this human and divine freedom?

Human freedom for Schelling is emphatically not an indeterminate power of willing. Rather, the determining ground of a person's choices must be sought in his intelligible essence or character, which stands to his particular acts as antecedent to consequent. Schelling depicts this intelligible character as the result of an original self-positing on the part of the ego. Thus the essence of man is his own act; necessity and freedom are mutually immanent. In the case of God, Schelling, consistent with his view of the God-world relationship, supposes something analogous. The rational will which takes up one's ground of existence and propels it in a particular direction is, in God, a will of love which stamps with its own character the impersonal ground of the divine Being. What in man are two temporal stages - the life of unconscious will and responsible freedom in the positing of rational will - are in God two eternal 'moments', related logically and ontologically but not chronologically. God is eternally love, and so eternally 'expansive' or self-communicating.³⁰ The total triumph of rational will or love over lower will is eternally accomplished in God while for us it is the as yet unattained goal of human history. How is this goal to be accomplished? Only in an active relation to God as the creative, personal Lord of being. By its own inner necessity the will demands that God should not be simply idea.³¹ The ego is conscious of its alienation from its ultimate source and centre, and aware that this alienation can only be overcome by the activity of the divine source. Thus the will demands of us the act of faith whereby God is postulated as an actual personal reality through whom we may be redeemed. The proof of God's existence must take the form, therefore, of showing the historical development of the religious consciousness: the history of man's demand for God and of God's response. Thus Schelling's last works are concerned

with mythology and the Judaeo-Christian revelation, and aim to exhibit therein God's progressive self-revelation to man, and the work of divine redemption in history which that entails.

While we are not concerned here with Schelling's speculations on the relation of pagan myth and biblical revelation, his suggestions for a periodisation of the Church's history are relevant both as an account of his concept of freedom and to the philosophical presuppositions of Afanasev's thought. Schelling's reading of Church history led him to propose a three stage division, which he was later delighted to find already adumbrated in the work of the twelfth century Calabrian abbot Joachim of Fiora.³² The first period Schelling termed 'Petrine'. He saw it as dominated by notions of law and authority, and correlates it with the ultimate divine ground of being, identified with the Father of traditional Trinitarian thought. The second period which he regarded it as initiated by the Reformation he calls 'Pauline', seeing it as governed by the idea of freedom, correlated with the ideal principle in God, identified with the Son. Finally, Schelling looked forward to what would be he hoped a 'Johannine' period, synthesizing the first two, uniting law and freedom in a truly Christian community. This third period he correlated with the divine love which embraced the first two 'moments' in God's inner life, real and ideal, and was identified with the Holy Spirit.³³ The contrast of a Petrine institutional Church and primacy with a Johannine mystical one provides the leading idea of S.N. Bulgakov's Sveti Petr i Ioann, dva pervoapostola of 1926, and remains a major theme in N.A. Berdyaev's Filosofiya svobodnago dukha, written three years later, at the time of Afanasev's arrival at Saint-Serge.³⁴ It is through these more philosophically gifted colleagues that the inheritance of Schelling's thought passed on to Afanasev.

ii. A theological scheme

In turning from a philosophical to a theological schematisation of possible ecclesiologies, we may well prefer to think more in terms of images than of models. For the specific qualities of many ecclesiologies from their organisation around certain great controlling images, rather than from a distinctive infrastructure of theoretical construction. The term 'image' serves to highlight the greater degree of concreteness which theological pictures of the Church are likely to possess. On the other hand, the term 'model' will remain serviceable, for some ecclesiologies, even in their properly theological aspects, are expressed in terms of an analogy with some feature of secular reality. In all, five theological accounts of the Church may be proposed as covering between them the great majority of ecclesiologies offered in the tradition.³⁵ Not considered here are those ecclesiologies which are pure Kirchenbild rather than Kirchenbegriff, though from Bede to Hans Urs von Balthasar such a 'figural' approach to the mystery of the Church has been preferred by some.³⁶

1. The Church as Heilsanstalt. An account of the Church as social institution carrying with it the means of salvation is the most familiar ecclesiological pattern in the period between the Council of Trent and the present century both in Catholic and in Orthodox writing. The notion that the Church is best compared with a social institution derives from the awareness that Jesus in commissioning the Twelve as leaders of a company of disciples founded a visible community endowed with a common mission and the means whereby to realise it. The notes of visibility and community are brought together in the concept of society or

institution. Although the classic statement of this model is usually taken to be the mini-treatise on the Church contained in Robert Bellarmine's De controversiis, its origins lie much further back. While Bellarmine's statement that the Church is a society as visible and palpable as any earthly society attains a rare degree of sharpness, the underlying picture of the Church as a kingdom differing from others only in the supernatural character of its foundation and end can be found at the very beginnings of formal ecclesiology, namely in the early fourteenth century Latin West.³⁷ However, in authors of this early period like James of Viterbo and John of Paris the societal model is modified by appeal to the idea of the Church as mystical body, thus complementing reference to the external, visible aspects of the Church's being by evocation of more interior, invisible features.³⁸ The struggles of orthodox Churchmen with such movements as Spiritual Franciscanism, the sectarianism of the supporters of Wyclif and Hus, radical Conciliarism and finally the sixteenth century European Reformation led to an exclusive concentration on the visible structure of the Church, despite such exceptions as John of Turrecremata's Summa de Ecclesia.³⁹ Luther's dichotomy between the invisible-spiritual and visible-natural orders, with the latter consigned to the reign of sin, simply accentuated by reaction what was already the dominant tendency in Catholic ecclesiology to produce Bellarmine's classic statement of the societal model.⁴⁰ There the Church is defined as all those professing or externally confessing the right faith, communicating in valid sacraments and obeying legitimate pastors. Though the element of government is mentioned last, an account of relationship to 'lawful' pastors is necessary for a proper determination of what counts as 'right' faith and 'valid' sacraments.⁴¹ Thus the model leads to a highlighting

of the element of governance, seen as the formal aspect which makes a society what it is. The persistence of this model may be noted in B.C. Butler's The Idea of the Church where the Catholic Church is described as a single, concrete historical society with

a constitution, a set of rules, a governing body
and a set of actual members who accept this constitution
and these rules as binding on them.⁴²

A sound ecclesiology must do justice to the sense in which the Church is such a concrete society, but this demand does not necessarily require than an ecclesiology be created on the basis of the concept of society.⁴³

2. The Church as mystical body or mystical communion. The fundamental idea in this ecclesiological type is the extension of the Trinitarian communion of Father, Son and Holy Spirit into finite reality. Such extension takes the form of an interchange of fraternal assistance among men. Here the interior, invisible dimension, the Trinitarian and Christological communication of grace or charity, is fundamental: the outward and visible bonds of brotherhood are its outworking. In a line of development issuing from the patristic period, and notably from Augustine, two levels of reality are recognised in the Church, referred to by Augustine as communio sacramentorum and societas sanctorum.

Les sacrements sont des choses, des réalités corporelles et sensibles; ils se rattachent à l'oeuvre du Verbe venu en notre chair, in forma servi. Ils créent entre ceux qui les possèdent et les fréquentent une communio, mais extérieure, corporelle, dans laquelle sont mêlés les mauvais et les bons. Mais les sacrements visent un effet de grâce et de salut, qui est l'oeuvre du Saint-Esprit, lequel n'est donné qu'à l'unitas, à la caritas qu'il met dans le coeur des saints.⁴⁴

The continuity linking these two levels is that shared by sacramentum and res, a reality still exterior and imperfect to a reality become perfectly what it is called to be. The recovery of such an ecclesiology, where the visible structures of the Church are seen as expressing an invisible divine reality was achieved in the Latin tradition principally through the Catholic Tübingen school who recovered the idea of the Church as supernatural organism, vivified by the Holy Spirit.⁴⁵ The two most prominent representatives of an ecclesiology of communion of this kind are Yves Congar and Jérôme Hamer. In his first major ecclesiological study, Chrétiens désunis, Congar saw the Church as, firstly, Ecclesia de Trinitate, the communication of the divine life and blessings; secondly, Ecclesia in Christo, the 'Christic' mediation of this communication, achieved most notably in the celebration of the sacraments; thirdly, Ecclesia ex hominibus, this mediated communication being carried out in accordance with the human condition which is incarnate, earthly and, therefore, social.⁴⁶ Hamer's concern was, similarly, to hold together the external and internal aspects of the Church's life. Conformably to the title of his L'Eglise est une communion he described the Church as

une communion à la fois intérieure et extérieure,
communion intérieure de vie spirituelle (de foi,
d'espérance et de charité) signifiée et engendrée
par une communion extérieure de profession de la foi,
de discipline et de vie sacramentelle.⁴⁷

Here the Bellarminian stress on the Church's social visibility is recontextualised within an account of the Church as mystery.

The model of mystical communion can be thought of as organised around two images: that of the mystical body, an organic or biological

image, and that of the people of God, a sociological image. Despite the sociological matrix of people of God ecclesiologies, these should not be confused with the societal model of the Church as Heilsanstalt since in them the populus Dei is, in Thomas' phrase, a multitudo ordinata in Deum, bearing a direct and determining reference to the God of grace and glory.⁴⁸ Revived by the Dominican M. Koster and the Benedictine Anscar Vonier, the people of God image underlines the continuity of the elect nations of the two Covenants.⁴⁹ 'People of God' is the principal paradigm used in Lumen Gentium, the dogmatic Constitution of the Second Vatican Council on the Church. Seeing the Church as a Spirit-filled though internally differentiated community, the image stresses immediate ordering to God. However, by allowing a greater distance between the populus and Christ, who awaits his Church at the end of history, it also makes possible the recognition of the Church as simultaneously holy and sinful, divine yet constantly in need of mercy and renewal.⁵⁰ Its weakness lies in its failure to advert in a systematic way to the distinguishing feature of life under the new Covenant, namely, the new relationship of man with the Father in Filio. More widespread in the theological tradition is the other main image taken by the mystical communion model, namely, the Church as mystical body. Here Augustine's contribution is outstanding.⁵¹ Yet in patristic use the Eastern fathers share much the same inheritance as the Western, save that it is perhaps characteristic of the East to locate the Church as body of Christ within a soteriological perspective of theōsis, as in the remarkable Third Oration of Anastasius of Antioch.⁵² This patristic heritage, fitfully continued in the Scholastics, was brought into play both by German and Roman theologians in the wake of its recovery by J.A. Möhler.⁵³ Möhler's influence on the Roman school was most notable

in Carlo Passaglia's De Ecclesia Christi; through Passaglia's collaborator Klemens Schrader who provided the First Vatican Council with its draft schema on the Church, opening with an exposition of the Church as Christ's mystical body, this line of development received official sanction in Pope Pius XII's encyclical letter Mystici corporis Christi, itself linked to the 1870 schema by Leo XIII's Satis cognitum and Divinum illud.⁵⁴ Pius XII's letter was, however, more immediately a response to the gravamina of archbishop Conrad Groeber of Freiburg against the abuse of a mystical body ecclesiology in such ecclesiologists as Karl Pelz with his suggestion that the unity realised in the body might be compared to the Eucharistic transsubstantiatio of elements.⁵⁵ The papal letter defended the model, but paid the price of a certain concordism by attempting to marry it with the societal model, which had dominated Roman theology since the publication of Louis Billot's classic Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi.⁵⁶ Thus the pope elided the distinction, important to the Latin patristic tradition as the researches of Emil Mersch amply demonstrated, between the Church as the society of baptised believers under the direction of lawful pastors, and the mystical Body proper, the unity of those who live with Christ's life. Only by such elision could the pope speak of the Catholic episcopate as the joints and ligaments of the Body. The distinction returns, however, in Lumen Gentium, which distinguishes between the Church as hierarchical society from the Church as the body of Christ, the inter-relation of the two being compared to that of the human and divine natures of the Word Incarnate.⁵⁷

Finally, in considering the mystical communion model, reference may be made to a work whose aim is to correct the imbalances to which a

one-sided exploration of the biological or sociological matrices of the model may lead. Heribert Mühlen's Una mystica Persona claims to retain the strongly pneumatological character of both basic metaphors - the Spirit as animator of the people of God, and as life-principle of the Body of Christ, while going beyond metaphor to produce a strictly or directly ontological account of the Church as communion. The distinctive feature of the Church is that in it many persons become mutually united without losing their identity. But this is properly the work of the Holy Spirit who within the Godhead is one person uniting the other two, vinculum amoris, vinculum caritatis. Similarly, in his economic function, the Spirit makes many finite persons one without their ceasing to be many. Fundamentally, the Church is one Person (the Holy Spirit) in many persons (ourselves through Christ). The union of the Church's members is neither organic nor sociological, much less institutional or juridical, in its essence. It is, rather, sui generis⁵⁸ and necessitates the coining of a new word, 'personological'. However, Mühlen has less to say about the expression of this pneumatic unity of believers at the external, visible level. Since the writing of Una mystica Persona the communion model has been utilised less to emphasise the Trinitarian and Christological rooting of the mystery of the Church and more to advocate a reconstitution of the government of the Catholic Church, so as to do fuller justice to the role of particular churches, considered as the fundamental subjects of ecclesial life and authority joined together in a communion of churches rather than as portions of the single universal Church-entity.⁵⁹

3. The Church as sacrament. The attempt to integrate more fully the invisible and visible aspects of the Church found a natural expression

in the concept of the Church as sacrament. The point of this paradigm is to bring into prominence the inseparability of the divine and human aspects of the Church, the mysteric and the institutional. Anticipated in various respects in the African fathers and mediaeval Scholasticism, its first modern representative is perhaps Matthias Joseph Scheeben.⁶⁰ From him, the influence of this ecclesiological type spread to Henri De Lubac, Otto Semmelroth and Karl Rahner, and from these Jesuit theologians it became widely disseminated in the theological cultures of Germany, the Low Countries and France.⁶¹ The fruits of theological renaissance in those churches were harvested at the Second Vatican Council, whose ecclesiology gives the concept of the Church as sacrament an important place, not least in the crucial opening paragraph of Lumen Gentium.⁶² The idea of sacrament is that of an efficacious sign, a symbol which brings about what it symbolises. Whether this be explained in terms of a theory of causality as with the mediaeval Schoolmen, or in terms of an anthropology as with Karl Rahner, the fundamental notion remains the same. As used in ecclesiology the sacramental idea enables us to articulate a grasp of the Church as signifying, in historically tangible form, the redeeming grace of Christ. The symbolic structures which constitute the Church as sign of Christ's redeeming work are on the one hand the seven sacraments and on the other the concrete expressions of faith, hope and charity found among those attached to Christ through the sacramental pattern. Because the Church is the milieu where the redemptive work of Christ becomes efficacious, signum, in the Holy Spirit, res, she is the primordial sacrament of the grace of God for men.

Sacrements et Eglise sont des réalités coextensives. Celle-ci naît de ceux-la, et ceux-la naissent de celle-ci. Ou il y a des sacrements il y a de l'Eglise, et ou il y a de l'Eglise, il y a des sacrements. L'eucharistie fait l'Eglise et l'Eglise fait l'eucharistie.⁶³

Peter Smulders has spoken in this connexion of the 'sakramental-kirchliche' character of Christian grace. The union with man God desires to establish grasps the whole man, body and soul, in both his individual personality and his social nature. To be fully what it expresses, grace must therefore become concrete in signs which are at one and the same time necessarily social and destined in the last analysis for the individual person.⁶⁴ The same author, pointing out that Lumen Gentium uses the sober Latin theological language of sign and instrument to express the Church's sacramental incarnation of God's saving design, comments further:

en mettant les deux terms, signe et instrument, sur le meme plan, on ne rend encore que fort imparfaitement la mystérieuse connexion qui caractérise la nature du sacrement. Il est une action divine oeuvre de l'Esprit, en en même temps rite visible, réalisation qui, tendant à l'achèvement, est à la fois résultat et instrument de l'action salutaire de Dieu, actualisation qui, tout en rappelant le ministere terrestre de Jesus-Christ, tourne l'esprit vers le Seigneur glorifié, dans l'attente de son retour. De l'Eglise, la Constitution dit précisément qu'elle a cette nature complexe de sacrement....C'est précisément ce que représentaient dans la langue du christianisme primitif les deux termes de mysterion et de sacramentum. Plus que simple instrument du salut, l'Eglise en est la forme terrestre, l'anticipation.⁶⁵

Yet this divine work is so incarnated in Jesus Christ that one cannot fully share in salvation without attaching oneself visibly and historically to him as founder of an earthly society.

4. The Church as creatura Verbi. This ecclesiological type sees the Church in relation to the Word of God, most notably as preached. The Church is a creation of the preached Word and becomes thereby its bearer and mediator.⁶⁶ While the sacramental model by no means excludes reference to the Word, for the Church as sacrament, like the individual sacramental rite, exists as embodied meaning with the inevitable linguistic dimension which that implies, nevertheless, the role of the Word is not highlighted in such an ecclesiology. The central feature of this model is the insistence that, in R. McBrien's words:

The Church is essentially a kerygmatic community, which holds aloft, through the preached Word, the wonderful deeds of God in past history, particularly his mighty act in Jesus Christ.⁶⁷

In terms of modern ecclesiological writing, such a paradigm has been introduced wherever the influence of Karl Barth has been felt in Catholic theology. Barth's originality, in fundamental ecclesiology, lay in making the Word of God both the constituent element of the invisible Church and the distinctive characteristic of the visible Church. This was made possible by assigning two diverse but related meanings to the phrase 'Word of God'. While to the Reformers the Word of God was simply the revelation given once-and-for-all in certain books, for Barth we have on the one hand the Word of God itself, a spontaneous, discontinuous, mysterious manifestation, and, on the other, the testimony to the Word of God collected together and handed down in the Bible. The Church, properly speaking an invisible reality, is founded on the Word of God;

the visible society which may also, really though derivatively, be termed Church, is founded on the testimony to the Word of God, the Bible.⁶⁸

Barth's view that, through her proclamation, the Church is essentially a herald of Christ's lordship and his future kingdom, is best represented in Catholic theology by the ecclesiology of Hans Küng. Thus in Die Kirche, the discussion of the Church as 'the eschatological community of salvation', which provides the foundation of Küng's ecclesiology is described as 'a study of relationship between the message of Jesus and the Church'. In his desire to avoid an ecclesiologia gloriae which would deny the wayfaring and sinful aspects of the Church Küng accentuates the 'basic difference' between the Church and the Kingdom or reign of God.

The Church is not the kingdom of God, but it looks towards the kingdom of God, waits for it, or rather makes a pilgrimage towards it, and is its herald, proclaiming it to the worldIt is not the bringer or bearer of the reign of God which is to come and is at the same time already present, but its voice, its announcer, its herald.⁶⁹

Picking up a number of Barthian themes on the relation between Word, Kingdom and Church, such an ecclesiology runs the risk of succumbing to an occasionalist account of the Church's being. If the Church is only actualised on the occasions when the Word is preached and heard, it becomes an occasional happening rather than a continuous incorporating reality.⁷⁰

5. The Church as diakonia. In this 'servant' model, the primary image is that of a community called to mirror the Suffering Servant

of the Isaianic corpus, regarded as a key to the identity of Jesus Christ. The Church is described in terms of a ministry of reconciliation and healing, in the memory of, and in the power of, her crucified Lord.⁷¹ However, the concept of diakonia as service to the world must be carefully handled if the Church's distinct identity and mission are to be secured. The tension between service and identity is a recurrent preoccupation of ecclesiologies which favour the Servant model, as Jürgen Moltmann has pointed out in his The Church in the Power of the Spirit.⁷² In Catholic use, the model has been given a deeper ontological rooting through the work of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. Maintaining that all energies in the universe were ultimately converging on Christ and, more specifically, that the Church is the consciously 'Christified' portion of the universe, Teilhard saw the Church's loving service to the world as the principal focal point of the world's energies of love. Or again, in a more balanced statement which attempts to do justice to the Church as simultaneously a created reality and an act of divine grace, he speaks of her as the

central axis of universal convergence, and the exact meeting-point that emerges between the universe and the Omega Point (i.e. God in Christ).⁷³

Within such a rudimentary classification of ecclesiological types, where should Afanasev's contribution be located? Afanasev's vision is fundamentally that of a proleptic realisation of the eschaton, expressed and realised through the celebration of the Eucharist and showing itself in a wider context by a life of agapé. The definition of the Church in terms of a relationship to the Kingdom, or the new aion which began at Pentecost, is reminiscent of the herald model, but the

connexion between the Church and the Kingdom in Afanasev is more intimate than utilisers of the herald model would normally allow. It is in fact indebted to a sacramental model, as is indicated by the fact that the Eucharist is in Afanasev's eyes both the chief creator of the Church's life and its prime expression. The stress on the life flowing from the Eucharist as a life of charity reminds one of the servant model, though the aspect of caritative service to the world does not emerge with any great clarity. Finally, the description of the members and ministers of the Church in terms of grace-borne office includes important elements of the mystical communion and societal models. In other words, Afanasev's ecclesiology integrates at least one feature from each of the five principal ecclesiological types outlined above, though they are not brought together systematically in any one place. Indeed, the occasional character of most of Afanasev's writings, together with the somewhat unbalanced structure of his main treatise, the Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo, where the reader can easily lose himself in a mass of detail, and whose Schellengian final chapter sits somewhat uneasily with the historical reconstructions of the Church of the New Testament and patristic periods which occupy the bulk of the work, militates against any attempt to draw a systematic ecclesiology from Afanasev's work. Furthermore, to say that elements of each of the five models are present there is not to say that all the legitimate features of these models have justice done to them.

Appendix C: an inventory of Afanasev's writing

1. published works

- (Nikola Afanasijev,) Državna vlast na vaselyenskim saborima, Skoplje 1927, = TsiZ 6 (1927) 348-358, 405-411, 7 (1928) 9-14, 97-104, 154-162, 230-236, 285-293, 353-359
- (Nikola Afanasijev,) 'Charizmatički učitelji prvih khrišćanskikh opština', TsiZ 7 (1928) 425-432
- 'Vselenske sobory. Po povodu „Obrășčeniya k pravoslavnym bogoslovam“, Put 25 (1930) 81-92
- 'Provincialniya sobraniya Rimskoi imperii i vselenske sobori. K voprosu ob učastii gosudarstvennoi vlasti na vselenskich soborach', Zapiski Russkago naučnago instituta v Belgrade 5 (1931) 25-46
- 'Bolšoi gorod', VRSKhD 7 (1931) 13-17
- 'Čto takoe vselenski sobor?', in: Sergievskie Listki (Paris) 7 (1932) 4-7
- 'Qu'est-ce qu'un Concile Oecuménique?', in MessOrth 6 (1959) 13-17
- Review: 'A. Kartašev, Na putyach k vselenskom soboru, Paris 1932', in: Put 37 (1933) 93-97
- 'Kanoni i kanoniceskoe soznanie', Put 39 (1933)
- 'Les canons et la conscience canonique', Cont 21 (1959) 112-127
- 'Ob izučenii Slova Božiya v svete Pravoslaviya', in: BRPK 1 (1934) 9-13
- L'étude de la parole de Dieu à la lumière de l'Orthodoxie', BAJO 1 (1934) 7-11
- 'V zaščitu celostnosti v škole', BRPK 2 (1934) 5-7
- 'Dve idei Vselenskoj Cerkvi', in Put 45 (1934) 16-29
- (N.N. Afanasiev,) 'Tva tankar om kyrkans allmänlighet', NoA 1 (1972/73) 88-100
- (Nikolai Afanassiew,) 'Das allgemeine Priestertum in der Orthodoxen Kirche', EHK 17 (1935) 334-340
- 'Nacionalnost i nacionalizm', BRPK 9 (1936) 12-15
- (N. Afanassieff,) 'Nationalité et nationalisme', BAJO 9 (1936) 11-14
- 'Neizmennoe i vremennoe v cerkovnykh kanonakh', in Zivoe Predanie (= Prav Mysl 3) (1937) 82-96
- 'The canons of the Church: Changeable or unchangeable?', SVSQ 11 (1967) 54-68

- 'Katoliceskaya cerkov i socialnyĭ vopros', Vestnik (1938) 1, 12-15
- 'Pamyati A.P. Dobroklonskago', ibid. 2, 16-17
- 'Služenie miryan v Tserkvi i vne eya', BRPK 17 (1938) 10-15
- 'Granitsy Tserkvi', in: PravMysl 7 (1949) 17-36
- 'Tainstva i taynodeystviya (Sacramenta et sacramentalia)', PravMysl 8 (1951) 17-34
- Trapeza Gospodnya (Paris 1952) (= L'Orthodoxie et l'actualité Nr.2/3)
- „Kogda vi sobiraetes.. v Cerkov ...” (1 Cor 11, 18), CVZE 24 (1950) 12-17
- 'Apostol Petr i Rimskij episkop. Po povodu knigi O. Kull'manna „Sv. Petr”', PravMysl 10 (1955) 7-32
- 'L'apôtre Pierre et l'évêque de Rome (A propos du livre d'Oscar Cullmann „Saint Pierre, disciple-apôtre-martyr”', Neuchâtel-Paris 1952) Theol(A) 26 (1955) 465-475; 620-641
- 'Le sacrement de l'assemblée, IKZ 46 (1956) 200-213
- 'O tserkovnym upravlenii i učitel'stve', CVZE 60 (1956) 18-25
- 'La doctrine de la primauté à la lumière de l'ecclésiologie', Ist. 4 (1957) 401-420
- 'Presvitidi ili predsedatel'nitsi. II-e pravilo Laodikiyskago sobora', CVZE 66 (1957) 13-24
- 'Kafoliceskaya Tserkov', in: PravMysl 11 (1957) 17-44
- (Nicholas Afanassiev,) 'Come, Lord Jesus. The problem of eschatology and history', SVSQ 1 (1957) Nr. 4, 5-15
- 'Ey, gradi, Gospodi Iisuse. K probleme eschatologii i istorii', VRSKhD 82 (1966) 69-81
- 'Nakhodilis li ostanki apostolov Petra i Pavla v katakombach? (O knige J. Carcopino, „De Pythagore aux Apôtres”. Étude sur la conversion du monde Romaine, Flammarion 1956)', CVZE 68 (1959) 13-21
- 'L'église qui préside dans l'Amour', in: N. Afanassieff et al, La primauté de Pierre dans l'Église Orthodoxe (Neuchâtel 1960) pp.7-64
- 'Das Hirtenamt der Kirche - in der Liebe der Gemeinde vorstehen', in: N. Afanassieff et al, Der Primat des Petrus in der Orthodoxen Kirche (Zürich 1961) [Bibliothek für Orthodoxe Theologie und Kirche, ed. B. Bobrinskoj et al. Vol.1], pp.7-65
- 'The church which presides in Love', in: J. Meyendorff et al., The Primacy of Peter (London 1963) [Library of Orthodox Theology and

Spirituality Vol.1], pp.57-110

'La chiesa che presiede nell' Amore.', in: O. Cullmann et al., Il primato di Pietro nel pensiero cristiano contemporaneo (Bologna 1965) 487-555

'„Statio Orbis"', Irén. 35 (1962) 65-75

'L'infailibilité de l'Église du point de vue d'un théologien orthodoxe', in: L'infailibilité de l'Église. Journées oecuméniques de Chevetogne 25-29 Septembre 1961 (Chevetogne 1962), pp.183-201

'Le concile dans la théologie orthodoxe russe', Irén. 35 (1962) 316-339

'Le concile dans la théologie russe, in: Synodika. Grammata epi tēs proparaskeues tēs Hagias kai Megalēs Synodou tēs Orthodoxou Ekklesiās (Chambésy-Genève I 1976), pp.43-64

'Das Konzil in der Russisch-Orthodoxen Theologie', KO 7 (1964) 33-52

'Una Sancta. En mémoire de Jean XXIII, le pape de l'Amour', Irén. 36 (1963) 436-475

'L'Eucharistie, principal lien entre les Catholiques et les Orthodoxes', Irén. 38 (1965) 337-339

'L'apôtre Pierre et la primauté de Rome. Libres réflexions après lecture', in: Daniel-Rops, Histoire de l'Église, II: Les apôtres et les martyrs [Collection: La meilleure Bibliothèque] (Paris 1965) pp.490-495

'Quelques réflexions sur les prières d'ordination de l'évêque et du presbytre dans la Tradition Apostolique', Pen Orth 1 (= PravMysl 12) (1966) 5-20

Réflexions d'un orthodoxe sur la collégialité des évêques', in: Mess Orth 29/30 (1965) 7-15

'Die Kollegialität der Bischöfe in orthodoxer Sicht', KO 9 (1966) 31-42

'„Mir" v Svyasčennom Pisanii', VRSKhD 86 (1967) 3-22

'L'Église de Dieu dans le Christ', Pen Orth 2 (= PravMysl 13) (1968) 1-38

'„Le monde" dans l'Écriture Sainte', Irén. 42 (1969) 6-32

Nikolay Afanasiev, Tserkov Dukha Svyatogo (Paris 1971)

Translation:

Nicolas Afanassieff, L'Église du Saint-Esprit (Paris 1975) [Cogitatio Fidei 83

Part publications or extracts:

'L'Église du Saint-Esprit' in: Ecclesia a Spiritu Sancto edocta.

Mélanges théologiques, hommage à Mgr. Gérard Philips. (Gembloux 1970) [Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovanensium 27], pp. 81-89

'Hē Ekklēsia tou Hagíou Pneumatos', GregPa 56 (1973) 185-195

'Narod svyatoy', PravMysl 6 (1948) 5-17

"Nikolay Afanasiev,) 'Ett Konungsligt prästerskap', NoA 1 (1972/73) 139-152

Služenie miryan v Cerkvi (Paris 1955) [L'Orthodoxie et l'actualité Nr. 4]

'The ministry of the laity in the Church', ER 10 (1958) 255-263

'Vlasti Lyubvi', in: PravMysl 14 (1971) 5-23

'Le pouvoir de l'Amour', in: MessOrth 39 (1967) 3-25

'Vlasti Lyubvi', CVZE 22 (1950) 3-5

Complementaria to Tserkov Dukha Svyatogo

'Neudavšijsya cerkovnyi okrug', PravMysl 9 (1953) 7-30

'L'assemblée Eucharistique unique dans l'église ancienne', Kl. 6 (1974) 1-36

'Le mariage dans le Christ', Cont 25 (1973) 202-217

'Vrata Cerkvi', VRKhD 114 (1974) 29-51; 115 (1975) 25-42

'Vstuplenie v Tserkov', VRKhD 120 (1977) 27-48; 122 (1977) 59-78; 126 (1978) 22-41

(N. Afanasieff,) De Kerk Gods in Christus. (The Hague n.d.) Privately printed by the Orthodox monastery of St John the Baptist

ii. unpublished works

Les Conciles Oecuméniques et le pouvoir de l'état. | Iva Edesskiy i ego vremya. K voprosu o „trech glavach“, 1930-32.

This is a well-documented study of the life and teaching of Ibas of Edessa, with particular reference to the debate over the 'Three Chapters'. Afanasev's conclusion is that, whatever doubts there may be about the orthodoxy of Nestorius himself, that of the ('Nestorian') Ibas is secure.

Cerkovnye sobori i ich proiskhozhdenie, ca. 1936-40.

The extant chapters deal with the idea of the council, the apostolic council, sobornost in the councils the councils of the third century with particular reference to Cyprian.

Word and Sacraments

Vstuplenie v Tserkov (Paris 1952)

An account of 'entry into the Church', written in 1952, a good deal of the material is drawn from Afanas'ev's published essays, while the whole is sketched out in lecture notes also. The chapters are:

1. The mystery, tainstvo, of initiation into the Church
2. The universality of Christian preaching
3. The order of complete initiation into the Church
4. The baptism of the laity, miryanskov kreshchenie
5. Repentance and faith, as conditions of entry into the Church
6. Proclamation
7. Godparents
8. The parrhesia of the baptised
9. Infant baptism
10. The reality of entry into the Church
11. Entry into the Church from schismatical and heretical communities

In lecture form, the material includes a final topic: 'leaving the Church', but this is omitted in the otherwise fuller version.

Ekkleziologiya: Vstuplenie v klir (Paris 1968)

'Initiation into the clergy'. The sections are:

- I. The sacrament of ordination:
 1. Common ideas about the sacrament of ordination
 2. Cheirotonia and cheirothesia.^{*}
 3. Election as the first moment of the sacrament of ordination
 4. The liturgy of ordination
 5. Reception of the liturgy of ordination
 6. Suspension of the laying on of hands
 7. The transfer of clerics
 8. The succession of clerics in service
- II. Conditions for entry into the clergy:
 1. General understanding of the qualities which must be possessed by candidates for ordination

* Ordinations performed 'at' the altar, and those performed 'away' from it, i.e. the commissioning of subdeacons and readers.

2. Physical qualities
3. Spiritual qualities
4. Moral qualities
5. A freely chosen public status

III. Conclusion

Notes for Lecture Courses

a. Studies preparatory to or linked with a course on aspects of the life and thought of the early Church

1. Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Marcionism
2. Religious debates and heresies: a) Monarchianism;
b) Teachings on the Logos
3. On the way to Arianism: a) The debate of the two Dionysii;
b) Lucian and his school.
4. Montanism
5. Chiliasm, millenarianism
6. Ecclesiastical debates: a) The Easter controversy; b) On the lapsed; c) The Baptismal controversy
7. Creeds
8. The New Testament and apocryphal literature
9. The fruits of Christian missionary activity by the beginning of the fourth century
10. Church organisation
11. Liturgical life
12. Instruction and schools
13. Christians and the world
14. The Church's property

b. Studies preparatory to or linked with A) Course on persecution in early Church, and B) Course on aspects of life and thought in early Church

(As to B), II here seems to be later than I and earlier than what will be summarised next as III)

1. Persecution. The Roman empire and the Church
2. Christianity and the cultural milieu
3. Religious syncretism and solar monotheism
4. Gnosticism, Marcionism, Manichaeism

5. Dogmatic currents: a) Adoptionism; b) Monarchianism;
c) Teachings on the Logos; d) On the way to Arianism: i) The debate of the two Dionysii; ii) Lucian; e) Chiliasm;
f) Montanism
 6. The Paschal dispute; debates on receiving heretics; the Baptismal controversy
- c. Studies preparatory to or linked with Course on aspects of life and thought of early Church
(This appears to be the latest version, but is highly incomplete)
- Apocryphal literature of the New Testament
 - Confessions of faith
 - Church organisation in the second and third centuries
 - Liturgical life
 - Christian art
 - The results of Christian mission by the start of the fourth century
- d. Course on persecution of Church in Roman empire
1. Church history in the second and third centuries
 2. The emperors and the Church
 3. History of the persecution
 4. Causes of persecution
 5. Quantity of victims
 6. Detailed history of persecution: a) Division of the history of persecution in the period; b) Persecution of Christians in the first century; c) Persecution of Christians in the second century, and the early part of the third: Trajan to Decius; d) Persecution of Christians in the later part of the third century: Decius to Constantine
- e. Studies preparatory to or linked with Course on the age of the Ecumenical Councils
1. Arianism. The history of the Arian debate up to the First Ecumenical Council
 2. The Council of Nicaea
 3. From the Council of Nicaea to the death of Arius
 4. From the death of Arius to the Council of Sardica

5. From the Council of Sardica to the death of Constans
 6. The politics of Constantius 350-357
 7. The Church's position in the time of Julian
 8. The Nicene triumph
 9. The Council of Constantinople, 381
 10. The Church's position in East and West up to the death of Theodosius
 11. Christianity and paganism
 12. The debate over Origenism
 13. John Chrysostom
 14. The beginnings of Nestorianism
 15. The Council of Ephesus, 431
- f. The Age of the Ecumenical Councils (and up to the time of Photius)
1. Arianism
 2. The Council of Nicaea
 3. From Nicaea to the death of Arius
 4. From the death of Arius to the Council of Sardica
 5. The Council of Sardica
 6. The politics of Constantius 350-357
 7. The Church's position under Julian
 8. From the death of Julian to Theodosius
 9. The triumph of the Nicene party
 10. The Council of Constantinople, 381
 11. The Church's position in East and West until the death of Theodosius
 12. The end of paganism
 13. The Origenist debate
 14. John Chrysostom
 15. Nestorianism
 16. The Council of Ephesus, 431
 17. Monophysitism: a) The Ephesian synod of 449; b) The Council of Chalcedon, 451; c) From Chalcedon to Justin I, 451-518; d) The religious policy of Justinian; e) The Fifth Ecumenical Council, 553; f) The religious policy of Justinian's successors.
 18. Monothelitism: a) The origins of Monothelitism; b) The Sixth Ecumenical Council, 680-681.

19. Iconoclasm: a) Causes of the emergence of Iconoclasm; b) The beginnings of Iconoclasm: the emperor Leo III; c) The Iconoclast Council of 754; d) The emperor Leo IV, 775-780; e) The Seventh Ecumenical Council; f) Iconoclasm after the Seventh Ecumenical Council; g) The triumph of Orthodoxy
 20. The age of Photius: a) The patriarch Ignatius; b) The patriarch Photius; c) The second patriarchate of Ignatius; d) The second patriarchate of Photius
- g. Course on the sources of canon law
1. Common concepts about the sources of law: a) Notions of 'legal sources'; b) Ecclesiastical documents as sources of Church law; c) Church tradition as source of Church law; d) Custom as source of Church law; e) Positive legislation as source of Church law: i) norms of ecclesiastical origin, ii) norms of State origin; f) The interpretation of Church laws; g) Collections of Church law
 2. Periodic division of the history of legal sources
 3. Conciliar resolutions: a) Resolutions of ecumenical councils; b) Resolutions of local councils; c) Resolutions of the Constantinopolitan synod: i) the significance of the resolutions of the Constantinopolitan synod and its rationale, ii) the object of the activities of the Constantinopolitan synod up to the fall of Constantinople, iii) some decisions of the Constantinopolitan synod after the fall of Constantinople, iv) other canons: (i) canonical letters and responses, accepted by ecumenical councils, (ii) supplementary laws
 4. State decisions: a) The issue of State ordinances as sources of Church law; b) The State-political activities of the Christian emperors; c) Collections of Roman-Byzantine law: the codifying activity of Justinian, the Ecloga, other legislative acts of Leo III, the Epanagoge, the Basilika
 5. The 'apostolic collections': a) 'Apostolic decisions': i) notions about the 'apostolic' collections, ii) common characteristics of the 'apostolic' collections, iii) the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, iv) the Didascalia, v) 'apostolic tradition', vi) 'apostolic decisions'; b) 'Apostolic laws'; c) Brief notice

of other 'apostolic' collections

6. Ecclesiastical collections: a) Chronological collections: i) the origins of chronological collections and their early history, ii) the 'lawbook' of the Council of Chalcedon, iii) the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, iv) the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, v) synopses of Church law; b) Systematic collections: i) the Collection in Fifty Titles, ii) the Collection in Fourteen Titles; c) Collections of State decisions on Church affairs: i) the Collection in Twenty-five Chapters, ii) the Collection in Eighty-seven Chapters, iii) the Collectio tripartita; d) Nomocanons: i) the idea of a nomocanon, ii) the Nomocanon in Fifty Titles, iii) the Nomocanon in Fourteen Titles, iv) the Alphabetical Syntagma, v) the Epitome, vi) the Nomocanon of Manuel; e) The Pedalion; f) The Athenian Syntagma; g) Special collections: i) thoughts about special collections, ii) monastic regulations, iii) penitential nomocanons: the Penitential Nomocanon of John the Faster, Penitentials, the Nomocanon in Two Hundred and Twenty-eight titles
7. The interpretation of Church law: a) Origins of the interpretation of Church law: glosses or scholia; b) John Zonaras; c) Theodore Balsamon; d) Alexis Aristines
8. The Corpus Juris Canonici: a) Common characteristics of the development of Church law in the West after the division of the Church: i) papal decretals, ii) general or ecumenical councils, iii) State decisions, iv) Concordats; b) Collections of Church law: i) Gratian's Decretum, ii) the Decretals of Gregory IX, iii) the 'Sixth Book' of Boniface VIII*, iv) the 'Seventh Book' of Clement VI†, the Corpus Juris Canonici; c) The Codex Juris Canonici
* The Liber Sextus Decretalium (1298)
† The Liber Septimus (1314?)
9. The 'symbolic books' of Protestantism: a) Ideas about 'symbolic books'; b) 'Church regulations'
10. The history of canon legal sources in the Church of Russia: a) Canon legal sources of Byzantine origin: i) Church resolutions, ii) State resolutions; b) Canon legal sources of

local Russian origin: i) Church ordinances: common characteristics, conciliar ordinances, decisions of the Holy Synod, canonical letters and canonical responses, ii) State legislation: common characteristics, Church regulations and charters, designations under the Khanate, related documents, judgments and codes under the Tsar Alexei Mikhailovič, the Spiritual Regulation; c) Collections of Church law: i) the Pilot's Book: a) the manuscript version(s): origins of the history of the Pilot's Book, the Slavonic Pilot's Book of the Council of Vladimir, the Serbian Pilot's Book of metropolitan Cyril, the two manuscript families of the Pilot's Book, b) the printed version of the Pilot's Book: the Pilot's Book of Vassian Patrikeov and metropolitan Macarius, the printed version of the Pilot's Book, ii) the Book of Laws, iii) statutes and instructions in different branches of Church government, iv) special collections: the Penitential Nomocanon of John the Faster, the Nomocanon attached to the Trebnik, didactic information; d) Monuments of liturgical origin: i) the Legal Scroll (Svitok zakonn'ii), ii) the Order for choosing and ordaining priests and deacons

h) Course on the organisation of the Russian Church

1. Central eparchal government up to Peter II
2. Local eparchal government up to Peter II
3. Eparchal government from Peter II onwards
4. Barochial organisation: a) Education in the parishes; b) Cathedrals; c) Prideli churches; d) Domestic churches; e) Finance; f) Parochial organisation according to the decrees of the Moscow sobor of 1917-1918; g) The parish council
5. Higher ecclesiastical government in the Russian Church: a) The patriarchal period; b) The synodal period; c) Higher ecclesiastical government according to the provisions of the Moscow sobor of 1917-1918

i) Course on monasticism

1. The origins of monasticism and attitudes to its influence in the Church

2. Monasticism as a personal state in the Church
 3. Monasticism and the clergy
 4. Secondary aspects of the monastic life
 5. Degrees of monastic engagement
 6. Entry into the monastic state
 7. The form of entry into the monastic state
 8. Responsibilities of the monastic order
 9. Leaving the monastic life
 10. The reality of entry into the monastic life
 11. Monasticism in Russia
- j. Course on the canon law of marriage
1. Marriage legislation
 2. The definition of marriage
 3. Marriage as a sacrament
 4. Forms of a valid marriage
 5. Conditions for a valid marriage: a) Relationship and affinity;
b) Spiritual affinity
 6. The dissolution of marriage
- k. Course on the marriage of clerics
1. Celibacy in the West
 2. Celibacy of bishops in the East
 3. The married life of the presbyters and other clerics
 4. Resolutions on the first and second marriages of clerics

Preface - Notes

1. F.M. Abel, O.P., 'Ecrits des dominicains sur la Terre Sainte', in I. Taurisano (ed.), Miscellanea dominicana in memoriam VII anni saecularis ab obitu sancti patris Dominici (Rome 1923), p. 244.
2. G. Golubovich, O.F.M., 'San Domenico nell' apostolato di suoi figli in Oriente', in *ibid.*, p. 208.
3. A.M. Walz, O.P., Compendium Historiae Ordinis Praedicatorum (Rome 1930), pp. 173-4.
4. D. Nicol, Church and Society in the Last Centuries of Byzantium (Cambridge 1979), pp. 77-80. Professor Joan Hussey speaks of the Dominicans (and Franciscans) in this connexion as the 'diplomats of the Papacy', The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire (Oxford 1986), pp. 214-215.
5. H. Woroniechi, O.P., 'La rayonnement de l'ordre de saint Dominique en Pologne', in I. Taurisano (ed.), Miscellanea dominicana, *op. cit.*, p. 245.
6. M.A. Van den Oudenrijn, Annotationes bibliographiae Armeno-Dominicanae (Rome 1921).
7. M.-H. Laurent, Le bienheureux Innocent V (Pierre de Tarantaise) et son temps (Rome 1947); B. Roberg, Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem zweiten Konzil von Lyon, 1274 (Bonn 1964).
8. P. Glorieux (ed.), S. Thomas d'Aquin, Contra errores Graecorum (Tournai 1957); for a critical introduction see R.A. Verardo, O.P., S. Thomae Aquinatis Opuscula Theologica I (Turin 1954), pp. 269-314.

9. Y.M.-J. Congar, O.P., 'Saint Thomas Aquinas and the meaning of ecumenism', New Blackfriars, 55.648 (1974), pp. 196-209.
10. For Humbert's treatise, see P. Crabbe, Concilia omnia, II (Cologne 1551), pp. 967-1003.
11. G. Florovsky, The Ways of Russian Theology (Belmont, Massachusetts 1979), pp. 16-17.
12. A. Krchnák, De vita et operibus Joannis de Ragusio (1930). The important collection of Greek MSS. Stoyković bequeathed to the Dominican house at Basle was used by Erasmus in preparing his editions of the Greek New Testament and various fathers: 'John of Ragusa', F.L. Cross and E. Livingstone (eds.), Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (London 1974²), p. 753.
13. E. Candal (ed.), Concilium florentinum: documenta et scriptores (Rome 1940-), II.1.
14. Vestiges of the once flourishing Congregatio Peregrinantium: see R. Loenertz, O.P., La Société des Frères Pérégrinants. Etude sur l'Orient dominicain (Rome 1937).
15. On Goar, see R. Coulon, O.P., 'Goar, Jacques', Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique, VI (1920), cols. 1467-9.
16. On Combefis, see *ibid.*, 'Combefis, François', Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, III (1908), cols. 385-387. On Lequien, I. Carreyre, 'Lequien, Michel', Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique, IX.1 (1926), cols. 441-3, and S. Salaville, A.A., 'IIe Centénaire de Michel le Quien', Echos d'orient, 32 (1933), pp. 257-266.
17. Its final representative was Jean-Maurice Amoudru, clandestinely consecrated bishop in Leningrad in 1935 and expelled from the U.S.S.R. shortly afterwards. See

H.J. Stehle, Eastern Politics of the Vatican 1917-1979 (Athens, Ohio 1981), p.

18. A. Eszer, O.P., 'Ekaterina Sienskaja Abrikosova und die Kongregation der Schwestern des III Ordens vom hl. Dominikus zu Moskau', Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 40 (1970), pp. 277-373.
19. E. Fouilloux, Les Catholiques et l'unité chrétienne du XIXe au XXe siècle (Paris 1982), pp. 103-105.
20. For the aim of Russie et Chrétienté, see I (1934), p. 8:
À nous de découvrir les richesses trop ignorées
chez nous du passé chrétien de la Russie; à nous
d'apprécier dans la Russie d'aujourd'hui le bien,
si mêlé qu'il soit de mal permis par Dieu.
The change of name and, in part, direction was explained
in Istina, I (1954), p. 3:
...les visées d'expansion mondiale du communisme
soviétique et la conjoncture qu'elles créent pour
le christianisme en général ont fait apparaître
sous un jour nouveau la question des rapports
existant - ou n'existant pas, jusque-là - entre
les diverses confessions chrétiennes. Le problème
du remembrement de tous les disciples du Christ en
l'Unité de son Eglise a commencé d'être perçu dans
tout son urgence et son acuité.
C.f. C.J. Dumont, O.P., Les Voies de l'unité chrétienne
(Paris 1954).
21. J.P. Jossua, O.P., Le Père Congar. La Théologie au service
du Peuple de Dieu (Paris 1967), pp. 71-2, 85-6; Y.M.-J.
Congar. Une Passion: l'unité (Paris 1974), pp. 11, 18-19,
21-22.
22. Documentation catholique, LXXVII.1790 (20.7.1980), p. 703.
23. Ibid., p. 705, with references to the decree on ecumenism

of the Second Vatican Council, Unitatis redintegratio,
14, 17.

24. Documentation catholique, LXXVI.1775 (16.12.1979), p. 1061.

Chapter I - Notes

1. For general overviews of the development of Russian theology, G. Florovski, Puti Russkogo bogosloviya (Paris 1937), E.t., The Ways of Russian Theology I (Belmont, Massachusetts 1979); M. Gordillo, 'Russie (Pensée religieuse)', DTC, XIV.A, cols. 207-371.
2. For a significant conflation of the two discussions, see F.M. Dostoevski, Bratya Karamozovi (Petrograd 1970), pp. 68-76; E.t., The Brothers Karamazov (London 1927), I, pp. 56-63.
3. P. Pascal, The Religion of the Russian People (London 1976), pp. 3-53.
4. The absence of serious dogmatic or speculative theology in the Kievan (or 'pre-Mongol') and Mongol periods is generally agreed, while opinion is divided on the evaluation of such homilectic and controversial literature as survives. For the controversy between E.E. Golubinskii and N. Nikolskii in this regard see M. Gordillo, art. cit., cols. 216-217 with bibliography.
5. Hilarion's account of the Christian body as belonging to an eschatological era of charity defined over against the Mosaic law is strangely prophetic of Afanasev's work. See G. Florovsky, The Ways of Russian Theology, op. cit., p. 1; G.P. Fedotov, The Russian Religious Mind (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1946), I, p. 40.
6. For Kurbskii's work, see G. Florovsky, The Ways of Russian Theology, op. cit., pp. 39-42. On the translation of the fathers into Russian, C. Kern, Les Traductions russes des textes patristiques (Chevetogne-Paris 1957).

7. On Maksim, see M. Gordillo, 'Maxime l'Haghiorite', DTC, X.A, cols. 460-463.
8. A. Herman, De fontibus iuris ecclesiastici Russorum (Rome 1936).
9. For the influence of Byzantine models of Church-State relations in the Kievan period, see F. Dvornik, 'Byzantine political ideas in Kievan Russia', Dumbarton Oaks Papers, IX-X (1956). Under the Muscovite grand princes, later tsars, the theme of the emperor-in-the-Church took on a more rigorously Caesaropapist character in the context of a post-Byzantine Messianism. See J.H. Billington, 'The Muscovite Ideology', in his The Icon and the Axe. An interpretative history of Russian culture (London 1966), pp. 48-77.
10. G. Florovsky, The Ways of Russian Theology, op. cit., p.58-9.
11. M. Gordillo, 'Russie (Pensée religieuse)', art. cit., col. 208.
12. G. Florovsky, The Ways of Russian Theology, op. cit., p. 49.
13. Ibid., p. 60. It was on the incursion of Thomism, and related Latin Scholastic theologies, such as that of Francisco de Suarez, that Florovsky issued his celebrated judgment that 'the result was an ambiguous 'pseudomorphosis' of Orthodox thought, and to some extent also of Orthodox life', *ibid.*, p. 37. However, it should be noted that there is such a thing as Byzantine Thomism, not unconnected with the Aristotelean interests of a number of the later Greek fathers, especially Maximus the Confessor, John Damascene and Photius. For the Thomism of the Byzantine Latinophrones, see H.-G. Beck, 'Der Kampf der thomistischen Theologiebegriff im Byzanz', Divus Thomas, 13 (1935), pp. 1-22; G. de Rosa, 'La figura dell'Angelico nel pensiero teologica dell'Oriente cristiano slavo-byzantino', *ibid.*, 52 (1949), pp. 249-275; S. Papadopoulos, 'Thomas in Byzanz. Thomas-Rezeption und

Thomas-Kritik in Byzanz zwischen 1354 und 1435', Theologie und Philosophie, 49 (1974), pp. 274-304.

14. D. Obolenskii, 'Byzantium, Kiev and Moscow. A study in ecclesiastical relations', Dumbarton Oaks Papers, XI (1957).
15. Latin influence on the Russian Church prior to the late sixteenth century was of various kinds. For the pre-Mongol period, one should instance the request of Olga for Frankish missionaries in the Annals of Hildesheim; the missionary work of bishop Bruno among the Petchenegs under Vladimir, as described in a letter to the Saxon emperor Henry II; the translation of a number of hagiographical works, as well as extracts from liturgical offices, from Latin into Old Russian, probably through the agency of Western Slavs: see M. Gordillo, 'Russie (Pensée de)', art. cit., cols. 208-214. In the late eleventh century, the grand-prince Izjaslav corresponded with and sought the aid of the Roman pope Gregory VII, *ibid.*, cols. 214-215, and, more fully, T. Ediger, Russlands Älteste Beziehungen zu Deutschland, Frankreich und zur römischen Kurie (Halle 1911). Evidence of continued communion between the Russian and Latin churches in the Crusading period is provided by the travelogue of the abbot Daniel in the Holy Land: A. Leskien, 'Die Pilgerfahrt des russischen Abtes Daniels ins Heilige Land', Zeitschrift des Deutsch-Palaestina Vereins 7 (1884), cited M. Gordillo, art. cit., col. 220. Around 1143, the Tome of Leo was translated by a monk of the Pechterskaia Lavra who added a conclusion implicitly affirming the Roman primacy, *ibid.*, col. 227. However, at just this time the first anti-Latin treatises by native Russians were appearing through the work of Niphon of Novgorod, *ibid.* For the post-Mongol period, noteworthy is the lack of resistance to Isidore of Kiev's proclamation of the re-union of the Greek and Latin churches after the Council of Ferrara-Florence of 1438-9. Despite the lack of negative reaction, except at Vilna, the Muscovite grand-prince Basil rejected the union three days after its liturgical proclamation in the Assumption cathedral, Moscow, on 19

- March 1441. For Russian attitudes to Florence, see H. Schaeder, Moskau das dritte Rom (Hamburg 1929), pp. 15-28. The last main form Latin Christian influence took in the later middle ages belongs to the history of the Novgorod region in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Faced with heretical movements, notably that of the židovstvujuščiki, 'Judaisers', archbishop Gennadii commissioned the Slovene Dominican Veniamin to produce the first complete Russian Bible, and also arranged translations of such Latin works as Guillaume Durandus, Rationale divinarum officiorum and Nicholas of Lyra's De Messia eiusque adventu. In the Church-State quarrel over Church property, Gennadii and the monastic reformer Iosif Volotski turned to Latin sources for self-justification, G. Florovsky, The Ways of Russian Theology, op. cit., pp. 14-15.
16. See M. Jugie, 'Moghila, Pierre', DTC, X.B, cols. 2063-2081; much more fully on Moghila's circle, C. Golubyev, K. Mitropolit Petr Mogila i ego spodvižniki (Kiev 1883, 1898).
17. The most ancient course cycle from the Kiev school now extant is the series of twelve treatises entitled Tractatus theologici in collegio Kiiwo-mohileano traditi et explicati of 1693-7. For the general history of the Kievan school, see S. Golubev, Istoriya Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii (Kiev 1886).
18. A. Malvy & M. Viller (ed.), La Confession orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila - Orientalia christiana, X (1927), pp. 47-50.
19. M. Gordillo, art. cit., col. 349; A. Palmieri, Theologia dogmatica orthodoxa ad lumen catholicae doctrinae examinata (Florence 1911-1913²), I, pp. 157-9.
20. M. Gordillo, art. cit., cols. 307-324.
21. See G.K. Smirnov, Istoriia Moskovskii slavyano-greco-latinskoi akademii (Moscow 1895).

22. The Kamen Very, written in 1713, was not published until 1729. Suppressed in 1732 with the accession of Anne Joannovna copies were not released again until the advent of Elisabeth Petrovna, in 1749: M. Gordillo, art. cit., cols. 328-9.
23. T. Tschistovič, Feofan Prokopovič i ego vremena (St. Petersburg 1868).
24. Cited in G. Florovsky, The Ways of Russian Theology, op. cit., p. 125.
25. Cited in M. Gordillo, art. cit., col. 353.
26. Reglament dukhovniy (St. Petersburg 1721); P.C. Tondini, Le Règlement ecclésiastique de Pierre le Grand (Paris 1874).
27. Cited in G. Florovsky, The Ways of Russian Theology, op. cit., p. 145.
28. Described in B.-V. Titlinov, Dukhovnaya škola v Rossii v XIX stoletii (Vilna 1908-9).
29. M. Jugie, 'Philarète Drozdov', DTC, XII.A, cols. 1376-1396.
30. G. Florovsky judged that Drozdov's work marks the decisive moment in the nineteenth century 'Rückkehr zur Patristik' in Russian theology: 'Westliche Einflüsse in der russischen Theologie', Kyrios, 2 (1937), p. 15.
31. A. Kniazeff, 'L'Enracinement', in L'Institut Saint-Serge. De l'académie d'autrefois au rayonnement d'aujourd'hui (Paris 1974), pp. 27-9.
32. Published at Černigov: for Filaret's work, see S. Smirnov, Filaret arkhiepiskop Černigovskii (Tambov 1880).
33. C. Kern, Les Traductions russes des textes patristiques, op. cit., p. 12.

34. F. Gumilevskii, Obzor russkoi dukhovnoi literatury (Černigov 1859); Makarii Bulgakov's writings on the Kievan school, the schism of the Old Believers, and the general story of the Russian church up to 1667 are described and evaluated in T. Titov, Makarii Bulgakov, mitropolit Moskovskii i Kolomenskii (Kiev 1895, 1903).

35. F. Gumilevskii, Pravoslavnoe dogmatičeskoe bogoslovie (Černigov, 1854, 1865); M. Bulgakov, Pravoslavnoe dogmatičeskoe bogoslovie (St. Petersburg 1849-53), = Théologie dogmatique orthodoxe (Paris 1859-60). Bulgakov produced a remarkably balanced ecclesiology, seeing the Church as the society of those rightly believing in and baptised into Jesus Christ, who vivifies it both by 'external' (ministry, sacraments) and 'internal' (pneumatic) means.

36. See P.K. Christoff, An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Slavophilism. A study in ideas, I. A.S. Khomiakov (The Hague 1961).

37. N.V. Raisanovski, Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1952).

38. From an enormous literature see especially A. Gratieux, Khomiakov et le mouvement slavophil (Paris 1939); F.C. Suttner, Offenbarung, Gnade und Kirche bei A.S. Chomiakov (Würzburg 1967); P.P. O'Leary, The Triune Church. A study in the ecclesiology of A.S. Khomiakov (Dublin 1982).

39. For the philosophical climate of Russia in the 1830's, see C. Quénet, Tchaadev et les lettres philosophiques (Paris 1931), pp. 204 ff. For Khomiakov's philosophy, see N.O. Lossky, History of Russian Philosophy (London 1951), pp. 29-41; also P.P. O'Leary, The Triune Church, op. cit., pp. 24-44. Theological Slavophilism has been defined as a concrete idealism, in the sense that its practitioners saw it as the only concrete form which could answer fully the requirements of the new philosophy: thus N. Berdyaev, A.S. Khomiakov (Moscow 1912), p. 117.

40. The term sobornost is based on the text of a late mediaeval Slavonic revision of the creed of Nicaea-Constantinople. Originally, the old Slavonic version had two edinou sviatou kafolitčeskoou i apostoliskoou tserkov, but the word kafolitčeskoou was replaced by sobornouu when the Russian church hardened its attitude to the Papacy during the Reunion movement under the last Byzantine emperors. Sobornaia means at root 'gathering together' as distinct from 'spread through the whole world' (assuming that this is the fundamental sense of katholikos). The neologism could stand, therefore, for either an ecumenical or a national church-polity. See A. Gegen, Istoriia slavianskago perevoda simvolov very (St. Petersburg 1884), pp. 90-102.
41. P.P. O'Leary, The Triune Church, op. cit., p. 89.
42. A.S. Khomiakov, Letter of 6 June 1851, cited in P.K. Christoff, An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Russian Slavophilism. I, op. cit., p. 142.
43. M. Gordillo, 'Russie (Pensée de)', art. cit., cols. 360-1.
44. Khomiakov's interest in Schelling was partly the fruit of his collaboration with his fellow-Slavophile I.V. Kireevski, a pupil of Schelling, but the Schellengian philosophy was 'in the air' in contemporary Russia, as is shown by W. Setschkareff, Schellings Einfluss in der russischen Theologie der zwanziger und dreissiger Jahre des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (Leipzig 1939).
45. P.K. Christoff, An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Russian Slavophilism. I, op. cit., p. 137.
46. A.S. Khomiakov, L'Église latine et le protestantisme au point de vue de l'Église d'Orient (Lausanne 1872), p. 267.

47. J.S. Romanides, 'Orthodox ecclesiology according to Alexis Khomiakov', The Greek Orthodox Theological Review, 2 (1956), p. 67.
48. A.S. Khomiakov, L'Église latine et le protestantisme au point de vue de l'Église d'Orient, op. cit., p. 381.
49. P.K. Christoff maintains that 'the importance of this event for Khomjakov can hardly be over-estimated', An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Russian Slavophilism, I, op. cit., p. 94.
50. See A. Stawrowsky, Essai de théologie irénique, L'Orthodoxie et le catholicisme (Madrid 1966), p. 25.
51. B. Schultze S.J., 'Chomjakov und das Halbjahrtausend Jubiläum des Einigungskonzils von Florenz', Orientalia Christiana Periodica, 4 (1938), pp. 473-496, points out the connection between the problem of Florence's formal ecumenicity and the debate on reception which Khomiakov stimulated in Orthodox thought.
52. In a manner prophetic of Afanasev's much fuller historical study, Khomiakov was in part brought to this conclusion by his investigation of the early councils: see L'Église latine et le protestantisme au point de vue de l'Église d'Orient, op. cit., pp. 61-2.
53. Cited in P.K. Christoff, An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Russian Slavophilism, I, op. cit., p. 161. For the Palmer-Khomiakov correspondence, see W. Birkbeck, Russia and the English Church during the last fifty years (London 1895).
54. The principal Russian criticisms of Khomiakovian ecclesiology were set out in T. Andreev, 'Moskovskaya dukhovnaya akademiya i Slavyanofili', Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 3 (1915), pp. 563-644; a wider critique of Slavophile theology is found in N. Barsov, Novyi metod v bogoslovie (St. Petersburg 1870).

55. A. Gratieux, Le mouvement slavophil à la veille de la Révolution (Paris 1959).
56. N. Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (London 1963).
57. Ibid., pp. 30-34.
58. J.H. Billington, The Icon and the Axe, op. cit., pp. 464-518.
59. Later published as a distinct work: D. Merezhkovsky, Tolstoi i Dostoevskii (St. Petersburg 1906); for the author himself, see J. Chezeville, Dmitri Merejkowsky (Paris 1922).
60. N. Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century, op. cit., p. 89.
61. J. Scherrer, Die Petersburger religiös-philosophischen Vereinigungen. Die Entwicklung des religiösen Selbstverständnisses ihrer Intelligentsia-Mitglieder 1901-1917 (Berlin 1973).
62. From a considerable literature, see D. Strémooukhoff, Vladimir Soloviev et son oeuvre messianique (Strasbourg 1935); M. d'Herbigny, Un Newman russe. Vladimir Soloviev (Paris 1911); E. Munzer, Solov'ev. Prophet of Russian and Western Unity (London 1956).
63. V.S. Solovyev, 'Čteniya o Bogočelovečeste', xi-xii = Sobranie sočinenii V.S. Soloveva (St. Petersburg 1911-1914), III, pp. 163-181.
64. V.S. Solovyev, 'Velikii spor i khristianskaya politika', Rus, 19 (1883); Istoriya i buduščnost teokratii, I (Zagreb 1887); his views on the Papacy were expounded for a Western Catholic public in La Russie et l'Église universelle (Paris 1889). See D. Strémooukhoff, Vladimir Soloviev et son oeuvre messianique, op. cit., pp. 63, 134-5.

65. M. d'Herbigny, Un Newman russe, op. cit., p. 314.
66. V.S. Solovyev, La Russie et l'Église universelle, op. cit., pp. 297-329
67. G. Florovsky, 'The problem of ecumenical encounter', in E.L.D. Fry and A.H. Armstrong (ed.), Rediscovering Eastern Christendom (London 1965), p. 70.
68. E.N. Trubetskoi, Umozrenie v kraskakh (Moscow 1906), an epoch-making work on the interpretation of icons as a locus theologicus: c.f. A. Nichols, The Art of God Incarnate. Theology and image in Christian tradition (London 1980), pp. 95-6.
69. P.A. Florensky, Stolp i utverzhenie istiny. Opyt pravoslavnoy teodicei v dvenadvati pismakh (Moscow 1906); cf. E.N. Trubetskoy, 'Svet favorskii i preobrazhenie uma', Russkaya mysl, 29.3 (1914), pp. 25-54.
70. R. Slesinski, Pavel Florensky. A metaphysics of love (Crestwood, New York 1984), p. 40; G. Florovsky, Puti Russkogo bogoslaviya, op. cit., p. 493.
71. P.A. Florensky, 'Ekklesiologičeskie materialy', Bogoslovskie trudy, 12 (1974), pp. 73-183.
72. P.A. Florensky, Stolp i utverzhenie istiny, op. cit., p. 350.
73. Ibid., pp. 350-1.
74. On Theophan, see T. Spidlik, S.J., La doctrine spirituelle de Théophane le reclus (Rome 1965); on Tikhon, N. Gorodetsky, Saint Tikhon Zadonsky. Inspirer of Dostoevsky (London 1951). For the translation project, see G. Florovsky, The Ways of Russian Theology, op. cit., pp. 126-7.

75. E.t., The Way of a Pilgrim (London 1954).
76. P. Evdokimov, 'The principal currents of Orthodox ecclesiology in the nineteenth century', Eastern Churches Review, X.1-2 (1978), p. 27.
77. I.I. Sergiev, Moia Žizn vo Christe (Moscow 1894); E.t., My Life in Christ (London 1897). For Cabasilas' work, see P.G. 150, cols. 491-726, and, more generally, M. Lot-Borodine, Un Maître de la spiritualité byzantine au XIV^e siècle, Nicolas Cabasilas (Paris 1958).

Chapter II - Notes

1. The biographical information included in what follows is drawn from a number of brief notices, notably: 'Protopresviter Nikolay Nikolayevič Afanas'ev (4.9.1883-4.12.1966)', Vestnik Russkago Studenčeskago Christianskago Dviženiya, 82 (1966), pp. 56-9; O. Rousseau, 'In Memoriam: Le R.P. Nicolas Afanasieff', Irénikon, 40 (1967), pp. 291-7; M. Afanas'eva, 'Nicolas Afanassieff (1893-1966). Essai de biographie', Contacts, 21 (1969), pp. 99-111; *ibid.*, 'Kak složilas Cerkov' Dukha Sviatogo', in N. Afanas ev, Cerkov' Dukha Sviatogo (Paris 1971), pp. i-ix; - 'La gènesè de l'Eglise du Saint Esprit', in N. Afanassieff, L'Eglise du Saint Esprit (Paris 1975), pp. 13-22. See also the biographical sketch in the only major study of Afanasev to date, P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche. Zur Entstehung und Entfaltung der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie Nikolay Afanas'evs 1893-1966 (Würzburg 1980), pp. 1-40. This work contains an exhaustive bibliography of Afanas ev's writings, translations thereof, and comments thereon. More can be said, however, about his lecture notes, preserved as these are in the library of the Institut Saint-Serge in Paris. I am grateful to Mlle. Eugénie Weynert for her help in locating these materials.
2. M. Afanaseva, 'Nicolas Afanassieff (1893-1966)', *art. cit.*, p. 99.
3. Among the many accounts of the immediately pre-revolutionary period, see R. Charques, The Twilight of Imperial Russia (London 1958); H. Seton-Watson, The Russian Empire 1801-1817 (Oxford 1967); R. Pipes (ed.), Revolutionary Russia (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1968); E. Crankshaw, The Shadow of the Winter Palace: the drift to revolution 1825-1917 (London 1976).

4. J.S. Curtiss, Church and State in Russia: the last years of the empire 1900-1917 (New York 1940); G. Simon, 'Church, State and Society', in G. Katkov et al. (ed.), Russia Enters the Twentieth Century (London 1971; 1973), pp. 199-235.
5. A.A. Bogolepov, 'Church Reform in Russia 1905-1918', St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, 10 (1966), pp. 12-66; J.W. Cunningham, A Vanquished Hope. The movement for Church renewal in Russia 1905-1906 (Crestwood, New York 1981).
6. J.S. Curtiss, Church and State in Russia, op. cit., p. 40.
7. Ibid., p. 71.
8. Mitropolit Nikanor, Besedy i Slova (Odessa 1903), pp. 207-8, cited in J.S. Curtiss, Church and State in Russia, op. cit., p. 76.
9. For Pobedonostsev's career and influence, see G. Simon, Pobedonoscev und die Kirchenpolitik des Heiligen Sinods 1880-1905 (Göttingen 1969).
10. N.D. Kuznetsow, Preobrazovanie v Russkoi Tserkvi (Moscow 1906), p. 114, cited in J.S. Curtiss, Church and State in Russia, op. cit., p. 31.
11. Ibid., pp. 211-282.
12. N.A. Berdyaev et al., Vekhi: sbornik statei o russkoi intelligentsii (Moscow 1909).
13. A.A. Askol'dov et al., Iz glubiny: sbornik statei o russkoi revolyutsii (Moscow 1918).
14. J.S. Curtiss, Church and State in Russia, op. cit., pp. 290-345.
15. Cited ibid., p. 318.

16. For the Sobor, see A.A. Bogolepov, 'Church Reform in Russia 1905-1918', art. cit., pp. 44-66.
17. N. Brianchaninov, The Russian Church (London 1931), p. 157.
18. For the life of Tikhon (Vasily Ivanovič Bellavin 1866-1925), see M. Spinka, The Church in Soviet Russia (New York 1956), pp. 3-50. The Bolshevik coup at first strengthened the patriarchal party which argued for a single head to the Church in a time of crisis. However, the outcome was essentially a compromise between synodalists and patriarchalists.
19. T. Beeson, Discretion and Valour: religious conditions in Russia and eastern Europe (London 1974), pp. 26-52.
20. M. Spinka, The Church and the Russian Revolution (New York 1929), pp. 118-122.
21. See F. Heyer, Die Orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine 1917-1945 (Cologne 1953).
22. P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche, op. cit., p. 23.
23. F. Heyer, Die Orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine, op. cit., p. 44 ff.
24. See I. Deutscher, The Prophet Armed: Trotsky, 1879-1921 (Oxford 1974).
25. M. Afanaseva, 'Nicolas Afanassieff (1893-1966). Essai de biographie', art. cit., p. 101.
26. P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche, op. cit., p. 26.

27. On the theological life of Serbia in the modern period, see G.A. Maloney, S.J., A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453 (Belmont, Massachusetts 1976), pp. 245-270.
28. N. Milaš, Codex canonum ecclesiae africanae (Zara 1881); Über die Kanonen-sammlungen der Orthodoxen Kirche (Neusatz 1886). Milaš's Pravoslavno-tserkveno pravo was first published at Zara in 1890. Part V of the second edition (Mostar 1902), is devoted to Church-State relations. C. Metrovič and I. Bogovič produced canonical studies centering on the jurisdictional limits of Church and State and the mutual relations of the two powers: G.A. Maloney, S.J., A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453, op. cit., p. 262.
29. M. Afanaseva, 'Nicolas Afanassieff (1893-1966). Essai de biographie', art. cit., p. 103.
30. Letter from Mme. Afanaseva to Peter Plank, 8 July 1978, cited P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche, op. cit., p. 27.
31. M. d'Herbigny & H. Deubner, Evêques russes en exil. Douze ans d'épreuves 1918-1930 (Rome 1931).
32. For the life of Anthony Krapovitsky (successively bishop of Kharkov and metropolitan of Kiev) see N. Rklitsky, Zhizneopsianiye blaženneyskago Antoniya mitropolitya Kievskago i Galitskago (New York 1957). For Evlogy Georgievsky, see his autobiography, Put moei Žizni (Paris 1947).
33. For Soviet policy towards the Church, in addition to works already cited see J.S. Curtiss, The Russian Church and the Soviet State 1917-1950 (Boston, Massachusetts 1953); M. Bourdeaux, Patriarchs and Prophets (London 1970); G. Simon, Church, State and Opposition in the U.S.S.R. (London 1974); D. Pospelovsky, The Russian Church under the Soviet Regime (Crestwood, New York 1984).

34. D. Pospelovsky, The Russian Church under the Soviet Regime, op. cit., I, pp. 43-92.

35. Despite some genuine reformist elements, the opponents of Tikhon within the Church inside the Soviet Union were chiefly those who saw both survival and advancement in vocal support for the new regime. In 1943 Stalin rewarded Sergey for his docility by allowing him to be made patriarch, M. Spinka, The Church in Soviet Russia, op. cit., p. x. The succeeding patriarch Aleksei (Simansky) continued this policy from 1946 onwards, *ibid.*, pp. 101-156.

36. For the founding and subsequent history of the Institut Saint-Serge, see D.A. Lowrie, S. Sergius in Paris: the Orthodox Theological Institute (London 1954); A. Kniazeff, L'Institut Saint-Serge. De l'Académie d'autrefois au rayonnement d'aujourd'hui (Paris 1974).

37. D.A. Lowrie, S. Sergius in Paris, op. cit., p. 4; see also P. Kovalevsky, La Dispersion russe (Chauny en Aisne 1951).

38. Cited in D.A. Lowrie, S. Sergius in Paris, op. cit., p. 11.

39. Sergei (in religion Cassian) Bezobrazov concerned himself with primitive Christology in his Christos i pervoe christianskoe pokoppenie (Paris 1950), building on earlier studies of the Johannine writings, La Pentecôte Johannique (Valence 1939). See N. Kulomzin, 'Pamjati episkopa Kassiana 29.2.1892-4.2.1965', Vestnik Russkago Studnečeskago Christianskago Dviženiya, 77 (1965), pp. 42-50.

40. For Sergei Nikolaevič Bulgakov, see J. Pain, 'Introduction', in J. Pain and N. Zernov, A Bulgakov Anthology (London 1976). For his writings, see K. Naumov, Bibliographie des Oeuvres de S. Boulgakov (Paris 1984). A précis of his teaching, which takes the notion of sophia, wisdom, as the key to the inter-relation of God and the world, is provided by his The Wisdom of God: a brief summary of

Sophiology (London 1937). The controversy his thought aroused is charted in C. Lialine, 'Le débat sophiologique', Irénikon, 13 (1936), pp. 168-205. For his ecclesiology, see below, Chapter VI.

41. V.V. Zenkovsky's studies in philosophical history are best represented in his Istoriya russkoi filosofii (Paris 1950), his own attempt at a synthesis suitable for Christian use in Osnovy khristianskoi filosofii (Paris 1964).
42. George Florovsky's work in historical theology ranged from patristic and Byzantine writers as in Vostochnye ottsy IV-go veka (Paris 1931) and Visantinskie Ottsy V-VIII vv (Paris 1933) to the major account of the development of Russian theological culture drawn on in Chapter I of this essay: Puti russkogo bogosloviya, op. cit. For his ecclesiology, see below, Chapter VI.
43. L.A. Zander was one of the numerous figures in the Diaspora haunted by Dostoevsky: see his Dostoevsky (London 1948). He also contributed a major analysis of Bulgakov's theology in Bog i Mir. Mirosozertsanie O.S. Bulgakov (Paris 1948).
44. Paul Evdokimov may be described as an haute-vulgarisateur of the school: the most influential of his numerous works was L'Orthodoxie (Neuchâtel 1959).
45. Vladimir Lossky came to be regarded as the most truly representative figure of the 'Paris School'. His Essai sur le théologie mystique de l'Eglise d'Orient (Paris 1944) is rightly seen as its most classic product. His own specialist work was, surprisingly, on a Latin theologian: published posthumously as Théologie négative et connaissance de Dieu chez Maître Eckhart (Paris 1960).
46. Konstantin (in religion Cyprian) Kern wrote on Palamism, as in Antropologiya sv. Grigoriya Palami (Paris 1950), and on the liturgy as a theological locus in Liturgika: gymnografiya

- i eortologiya (Paris 1954). His study Evcharistiya (Paris 1947) bears the sub-title, 'historical, theological and practical explanation of the Divine Liturgy'.
47. Jean Meyendorff played a major role in the revival of interest in Palamism in contemporary Orthodoxy, with his translation of the 'Defence of the Divine Hesychasts' and the accompanying study Introduction à l'étude de saint Grégoire Palamas (Paris 1959). His wider interests in ecclesiology and Church history were not so developed during Afanas'ev's lifetime.
 48. C.V. Motchulsky's Dostoevsky: his life and work (Princeton 1967) remains arguably the best introduction to its subject.
 49. V.V. Weidlé's chief interest was iconography and its theological significance: see his The Baptism of Art (Westminster 1950).
 50. For N.A. Berdyaev's thought, greatly influential in emigré circles in this period, see inter alia, O.F. Clarke, Introduction to Berdyaev (London 1950); D.A. Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet. A life of Nicholas Berdyaev (London 1960); F. Nusho, Berdyaev's Philosophy: the existential paradox of freedom and necessity (London 1967); for his ecclesiology, see Chapter VI.
 51. Semen Ludwig Frank was best known as an interpreter of earlier Russian thought, more especially that of Solovyev in his A Solovyev Anthology (London 1950). But he also produced a number of original studies in the philosophy of religion, e.g. Realnost i chelovek (Paris 1950). See R. Gläser, Die Frage nach Gott in der Philosophie S.L. Franks (Würzburg 1975).
 52. N.O. Lossky was best known for his Histoire de la philosophie russe des origines à 1950 (Paris 1954). His own intuitionist doctrine is expounded in Chuvstvennaya.

intellektualnaya i misticheskaya intuitiya (Paris 1928).

53. Brief biographical sketches of most of these figures may be found in N. Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century, op. cit.; see also G. Struve, Russian Literature in Exile (New York 1956). A bibliography of the writings of professors of the Institut Saint-Serge for the years 1925 to 1965 was published privately by L.A. Zander, see A. Kniazeff, L'Institut Saint-Serge, op. cit., p. 149.
54. D.A. Lowrie, S. Sergius in Paris, op. cit., pp. 26-7.
55. M. Afanaseva, 'La Génèse de L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit', art. cit., p. 17.
56. P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche, op. cit., p. 36. What especially struck Afanasev was Dix's account of the ante-Nicene church as a network of eucharistic assemblies, with the Eucharistic action as 'the act of the whole Body of Christ through its many members, each with his own 'office'', G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London 1945; 1982), p. 35. But despite this report of Mme. Afanaseva's, Afanasev's explicit references to Dix turn on points of detail, as in L'Eglise du Saint Esprit (Paris 1975), pp. 55, 181, 240.
57. His participation in the Dominican-organised Semaines du Saulchoir was important here, *ibid.*, p. 38.
58. Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani Secundi, I.IV (Vatican City 1971), p. 87, note 2.
59. For this event and its implications see V. Phidias, 'Anathèmes et schismes. Conséquences ecclésiologiques de la levée des anathèmes', Istina, 20 (1975), pp. 75-86; J. Ratzinger, 'Schisme anathématique. Les conséquences ecclésiologiques de la levée des anathèmes', *ibid.*, pp. 87-99.

60. O. Rousseau, 'In memoriam: le R.P. Nicolas Afanassieff',
art. cit., p. 297
61. N. Afanassieff, L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit (Paris 1975), pp.
32-3.
62. Acts 2, 21.

Chapter III:I - Notes

1. First and foremost in this block comes Afanasev's doctoral thesis, the bulk of which was published at Skoplje in 1927 under the title Vaselenski sabori i državna vlast ('The ecumenical councils and the power of the State'), and was reprinted shortly afterwards under the title 'Državna vlast na vselenskim saborima' in the form of a series of articles in the journal of the Serbian patriarchate Tsrkva i Život: vide *ibid.* 6 (1927), pp. 348-358, 405-411, and 7 (1928), pp. 9-14, 97-104, 154-162, 230-236, 285-293, 353-359. These two sets of articles will be referred to below by the abbreviation DVVS I and II, where the Roman numerals serve to distinguish the two numbers of the periodical in question. Some four years later, a Russian complement to this Serbian study appeared under the auspices of the Russian Institute of Sciences at Belgrade, bearing the title 'Provintsalniya sobraniya Rimskoi imperii i vselenskie sobori' ('The provincial assemblies of the Roman empire and the ecumenical councils'). Found at Zapiski Russkago Naučnago Instituta v Belgrade, 5 (1931), pp. 25-46, it is cited below as PSRIVS. Two articles of the idea of a council followed: firstly, in Berdyaev's journal Put, 'Vseleneskie sobori' ('The ecumenical councils'), found at Put, 25 (1930), pp. 81-92, referred to henceforth as VS, and, secondly, 'Čto takoe vselenski sobor?' ('What is an ecumenical council?'), Feuillets de Saint-Serge, VI.56 (1932), pp. 4-7, cited here as ČTVS.

2. DVVS I, p. 348. Afanasev's scholarly apparatus in these essays consists largely of material from G.D. Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio (Lucca 1758-1798), occasionally supplemented by references to the Greek ecclesiastical historians Eusebius, Socrates and Sozomen, as well as to Byzantine chroniclers, notably

Theophanes the Confessor. He makes some use of K.J. von Hefele, Conciliengeschichte in its second edition (Freiburg 1875). His enquiry into the social and legal background is mainly guided by late nineteenth century French ancient historians. The notes given in these two expository chapters confine themselves to reflecting Afanasev's own references.

3. DVVS I, pp. 350-352.
4. Ibid., pp. 353-4; c.f. Mansi XIII, pp. 205 ff.
5. Eusebius, Vita Constantini III.6, cited DVVS p. 355.
6. Mansi IV, col. 1111, cited p. 356.
7. DVVS I, pp. 356-7.
8. Ibid., pp. 405-6.
9. Ibid., pp. 408-410.
10. DVVS II, pp. 9-11.
11. Ibid., pp. 12-13.
12. Ibid., pp. 98-104.
13. Ibid., pp. 154-155.
14. PSRIVS, pp. 25-26.
15. Ibid., p. 27.
16. Ibid., p. 29. Afanasev follows here the work of the social historian N.D. Fustel de Coulanges in his influential La Cité antique (Strasbourg 1864; Paris 1900), and notably at pp. 131-132.

17. PSRIVS, p. 37: 'Even on a superficial comparison it is already clear that in matters of authority the concilia and the Christian councils of that age display startling similarities'.
18. Ibid., p. 41.
19. VS, p. 83.
20. Mansi VII, col. 425, cited VS, p. 87.
21. Ibid., p. 88: 'The council was not only an empirical institution but an organ of mystical grace'.
22. DVVS, p. 12.
23. CTVS, p. 6.
24. Mansi XI, col. 650, cited VS, p. 89.
25. VS, pp. 89-90.
26. Ibid., pp. 90-91.
27. CTVS, p. 7: 'The sole criterion for the true consists in truth itself. Or rather, truth needs no criteria'.
28. Ibid., p. 5. Afanasev refers the reader for further theological enlightenment on councils to two essays of S.N. Bulgakov: 'Očerki učeniya o Tserkvi', Put, 1 (1925), pp. 53-78, and 'Das Selbstbewusstsein der Kirche', Orient und Occident, 3 (1930), pp. 1-22. See below, chapter 6.
29. VS, p. 92. Afanasev's reflections on the desire of some Orthodox for a 'Pan-Orthodox council' can be found in his review of A.V. Kartashov, Na putyakh k vselenskomu soboru (Paris 1932), in Put, 39 (1933), pp. 1-16.

30. This 'theology of canon law' is found in two essays:
'Kanoni i kanoničeskoe sobranie' ('The canons and canonical consciousness'), Put, 39 (1933), pp. 1-16, cited below as KKS; and 'Neizmennoe i vremennoe v tserkovnikh kanonakh', ('Eternal and temporal elements in the Church's canons'), a contribution to an Orthodox symposium on the idea of Tradition Živoe Predanie (Paris 1936), pp. 82-96. This article will be referred to in what follows as NVTsK.
31. KKS, p. 3.
32. Ibid., p. 5.
33. Ibid., pp. 8-9.
34. Ibid., p. 10.
35. Ibid., p. 15: 'The function of the canons and, in general, of ecclesiastical law, is to assist, positively or negatively, the conforming of the Church's life to what dogma has to teach us about the Church's being'.
36. NVTsK, p. 83.
37. Ibid.: 'These two spheres are torn apart and receive a self-contained meaning. But this answer is not adequate, since in spite of emphasising the existence of two spheres in the Church, it does not establish any inter-relation or connection between them'.
38. Mansi XIII, cols. 417-418, cited NVTsK, p. 84.
39. Ibid., p. 85: 'Her duality is the duality of a divine-human organism and resembles that of Christ himself'.
40. Ibid., p. 87: 'Historical conditions do influence the forms of Church life, but not in the sense that these conditions prescribe various changes in the Church's life, for the

Church herself, from the depths of her essence, changes her forms of historical existence. The Church strives, under given historical conditions, to find a form that would more fully and completely express the Church's essence, the Church herself and her dogmatic teaching'.

41. Ibid., pp. 89-90.
42. Irenaeus, Adversus haereses, III, 24, 1, cited at p. 89. Such patristic references will be evaluated in Chapter V.
43. NVTsK, p. 96: 'The Church is striving forward and constantly awaiting the Coming, for which she ceaselessly sighs, "Come, Lord Jesus"'. .
44. 'Dve idei vselenskoj Tserkvi' appeared in Put, 45 (1934), pp. 16-29 and will be cited here as DIVTs.
45. Cyprian, Letter 55, 4, cited DIVTs, p. 17.
46. Ibid., pp. 17-19.
47. Thomas Aquinas, Summa contra Gentiles, IV.76, cited DIVTs, p. 20.
48. Ibid.: 'The pope's power is essentially one and universal, such that it aims to establish the Church's empirical unity through being head of the universal episcopate'.
49. Ibid., pp. 21-22.
50. Afanasev developed his attack on nationalism in 'Natsialnost i natsionalizm', Byulletin Religiozno-pedagogičeskago Kabineta, 9 (1936), pp. 12-15.
51. DIVTs, p. 25: 'Just as in the eucharistic sacrifice the whole Christ is present so in each ecclesial community there is the body of Christ in its plenitude'.

52. Ignatius, Ad Smyrnaeos 8, 2, cited DIVTs, p. 25.
53. Ibid.: 'The centre of that community is found not in the Jerusalem temple but in the eucharistic offering'.
54. Ignatius, Ad Smyrnaeos 8, 2; Ad Philadelphenos 4, cited DIVTs, p. 26.
55. Ibid., pp. 26-27: 'Christ is one and the same in each ecclesial community. The awareness of the fully real presence of Christ necessarily binds together each distinct community'.
56. Ignatius, Ad Trallianos 18, 1; Ad Philadelphenos 11,2, cited DIVTs, p. 27.
57. Ibid., pp. 28-29.
58. Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo was published in its definitive version (written between 1950 and 1955) in 1971, after its author's death. In an earlier version he had presented it as a doctoral thesis to the Institut Saint-Serge in 1950. It is known that the first chapter was written in 1940-1941. The 'definitive version' was itself, however, only the first part of a projected two part work, four of whose seven projected chapters are to be found among Afanasev's post-war ecclesiological essays. The story of the making of the book is told in M. Afanassieff, 'La Génèse de "L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit"', art. cit. In what follows Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo will be cited as TsDS.
59. TsDS, pp. 1-2.
60. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, III.24, , cited TsDS, p. 2.
61. That is, Peter's sermon in Acts 2,17 where Pentecost is identified with the fulfilment of Joel 3,1-5.

62. TsDS, p. 5: 'Being fully one, the Church was intrinsically universal, each local church containing all other distinct local churches'.
63. Ibid., pp. 6-7: 'Can there be a higher ministry than that of the person who occupies the place of the apostles in the eucharistic assembly?'
64. Mt 27,51; Hbs 12,22-24; I Pt 2,5 and 9-10; I Cor 12,13; II Cor 3,6; I Pt 2,3; Jn 3,22.
65. Tertullian, De exhortatione castitatis, 7.
66. TsDS, pp. 17-18.
67. Ibid., pp. 19-21.
68. Hippolytus, Traditio Apostolica, 22. By baptism and (especially) chrismation new Christians enter the ordo of the laity: c.f. S. Bulgakov, L'Orthodoxie (Paris 1932), p. 136.
69. Afanasev draws here on the post-war recovery of the ancient meaning of chrismation rites by Western scholars, and notably on L.S. Thornton, Confirmation: its place in the baptismal mystery (London 1954) and P.T. Camelot, 'Sur la théologie de la Confirmation', Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, 38 (1954), pp. 637-657.
70. Ambrose, De Mysteriis, 34; Cyril of Jerusalem, Katechēseis Mustagōgikai, IV.8; and, for the Sinai Euchologion, A. Dmitrievskii, Opisanie liturgičeskikh rukopisei (Kiev 1901), pp. 202-209.
71. Symeon of Thessalonica, Peri tōn Musteriōn, 68; for the crowning see H.D. Denzinger, Ritus Orientalium (Würzburg 1862), pp. 287 ff.

72. TsDS, pp. 33-34.
73. Justin, Apologia, I.65.
74. Ignatius, Ad Smyrnaeos, 8,2; Origen, In Leviticum Homiliae, 9,1; TsDS, p. 41.
75. Afanasev takes his information here from K. Holl, 'Die Entstehung der Bilderwand in der griechischen Kirche', Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, II (Tübingen 1927).
76. N. Milaš, Pravila pravoslavnoi Tserkvi s tolkovaniyami (St. Petersburg 1911), I, p. 558.
77. Justinian, Novellae, 137.
78. C. Kern, Evkharistiya (Paris 1947), pp. 42-134; John Chrysostom, Commentary on II Cor. 18,3; Denys of Alexandria: in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, VII.9; Theodoret of Cyr, Commentary on II Cor 1,20. Also, B. Sove, 'Evkharistiya v dvernei tserkvi i sovremennaya praktika', Živoe Predanie (Paris 1937), p. 171.
79. TsDS, pp. 65-6.
80. Ibid., pp. 66-71.
81. J. Daniélou, Origène (Paris 1948), pp. 74 ff.; and in Origen himself, In librum Numeri, XVI,9; In Matthaeum, XI,14.
82. C.f. I Cor 14,29; I Thess 5,21.
83. TsDS, p. 69: 'The entire life of the Church was organised on a juridical basis, and the Church herself became a State institution'.

84. Afanasev speaks highly in this regard of Cyprian's practice as evidenced in Letters 14,4; 29,1; 38,1.
85. TsDS, p. 71.
86. I Cor 12,27-30; Gregory Nazianzen, Homiliae 32, 11, 13, 21.
87. C.f. Justin, Apologia, I.67.
88. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, VI, 19.
89. TsDS, p. 73.
90. P. Dabin, Le Sacerdoce royale des fidèles dans la tradition ancienne et moderne (Paris 1941), p. 21.
91. TsDS, p. 80. For Khomiakov's idea of the inter-relation of freedom, truth and love, see above, pp. 15-16. For Berdyaev's notion of creativity, see below, p. 319.
92. TsDS, p. 81: 'The goal of theological research is the recovery and study of primitive tradition. That tradition, while remaining unchanged in the heart of the Church, frequently veils itself in what is temporal and transient'.
93. Ibid., p. 88: 'In the Church all are charismatics, for all receive gifts: however, these gifts are distributed according to the ministries'.
94. Didache, 11-12.
95. TsDS, pp. 105-106.
96. Afanasev also stresses the element of popular confirmation of this call to ministry and liturgical bestowal of gifts, as found in Hippolytus, Traditio apostolica, 4; and the element of reception ministers by other churches, as in Cyprian, Letter 55,8.

97. TsDS, pp. 107-108.
98. Here Afanasev draws on L. Cerfaux, 'Pour l'histoire du titre apostolos dans le Nouveau Testament', Revue des Sciences Religieuses, 48 (1960), p. 79. His general account of New Testament ministries is much indebted to O. Linton, Das Problem der Urkirche in der neueren Forschung (Uppsala 1932), as well as two fruits of earlier Russian ressourcement. He distances himself from the view of J. Munck, 'Paul, the apostles and the Twelve', Studia Theologica, III (1950), pp. 96-110, where the ascription of apostleship to the Twelve is regarded as a post-Pauline development: TsDS, pp. 108-120.
99. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, III.37,1; V.10,2-3.
100. TsDS, pp. 121-124.
101. Jn 14,26; Gal 1,8; Didache, 7.
102. Hermas, Precepta, XI.9-16; Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, III.24,1; Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, V.16,8; I Cor 14,29; I Thess 5,19-22.
103. TsDS, p. 135.
104. Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis, VII.16.
105. Epistola ad Diognetum, 11.
106. TsDS, p. 138: 'The didaskaloi were the learned theologians of the primitive Church, representatives of theological science at the Church's service'. Afanasev cites approvingly H. Greeven's judgment that 'ohne die didaskaloi der christlichen Gemeinden die Entstehung einer Überlieferung und letztlich des Kanons nicht zu denken ist', in 'Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus',

Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 53

(1931). Afanasev sees the Palestinian bishops who defended Origen against Denys of Alexandria, in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, VI.19,17 as representing an archaic tradition whereby didaskaloi addressed the liturgical assembly.

107. Afanasev's interest in 'charismatic' teaching figures in the early Church dates from a side-interest of his Serbian period. See 'Charizmatički učitelji prvich hrišćanskich opština', in Tsiz, 7 (1928), pp. 425-432. This essay appears much influenced by A. von Harnack, Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (Leipzig 1902). See P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche, op. cit., pp. 175-178.
108. TsDS, p. 143; 'That signifies that wherever a local church appeared, the ministry of the proestōs was simultaneously created. Whence the principal postulate of eucharistic ecclesiology: there can be no local church without the ministry of proestōs. Thus the proestōs is the distinctive empirical sign of the Catholic Church'.
109. Acts 6,1-6.
110. Phil 1,1; I Tim 3,8-13; Hippolytus, Traditio Apostolica, 9. The excursus on the Seven is found at TsDS, pp. 190-207.
111. Apoc 4,1-11.
112. Ignatius, Ad Magnesianos, 6.
113. TsDS, p. 190: 'In the Church of God in Christ there must be only one 'he who gives thanks', but there may be several 'presidents in the Lord'.
114. Ignatius, Ad Magnesianos 6,1.

115. Gal 1,19; 2,12; Acts 12,17; 15,13-21; III Jn 9; I Clem 47,6; I Pt 5,1-4: this material is evaluated at TsDS, pp. 208-235.
116. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, V.24; II Clem. 16.
117. Hegesippus: in Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica, II.23,4-5; Polycarp, in ibid., V.24,3; Epiphanius, Panarion 29,4; Jerome, De viris illustribus III.2; Didascalia of Addai.
118. TsDS, pp. 237-264.
119. II Tim 2,3.
120. Clement of Alexandria: in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, II.1,4; c.f. P.T. Camelot, Foi et gnose: introduction à l'étude de la connaissance mystique chez Clément d'Alexandrie (Paris 1945), pp. 90 ff.
121. J. Daniélou, Origène, op. cit., pp. 52 ff.
122. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, III.3,1.
123. TsDS, pp. 278-279.
124. Ibid., p. 283: 'Nonetheless, the primitive epoch remains a kind of ideal which allows us to control our own ecclesial life: it was a time when the Church's nature was translucently apparent through the texture of history'.
125. Ibid., p. 292: 'The existence of law in the Church is denied not only from a theologian's standpoint but also from a jurist's. But for me this has no importance. Naturally, however, the absence of legal norms in the Church does not mean the absence of rules of life. The question does not concern the existence of certain norms in the Church, but their nature'.

126. Ibid., p. 300.
127. Trapeza Gospodnya was published in Paris in 1952, and will be cited here as TG.
128. TG, pp. 5-7.
129. Ibid., p. 10: 'Where the Eucharistic assembly is, there is the Church, and where the Church is there is the eucharistic assembly'.
130. Ibid., p. 20: 'In the Church the Spirit is the organisational origin, i.e. in and through the Spirit the community of the first Christians became ecclesial'.
131. Ibid., pp. 29-68.
132. Ibid., pp. 69-86. See for the contemporary Western developments L. Sheppard, The People Worship: a History of the Liturgical Movement (New York 1967).
133. 'L'Eglise de Dieu dans le Christ', La Pensée Orthodoxe, 2 (1968), pp. 1-38. Henceforth cited as EDC.
134. Ibid., pp. 19 ff.
135. Ibid., p. 32.
136. 'Kafoličeskaya Tserkov', Prav. Mysl, 11 (1957), pp. 17-44. Cited below as KTs.
137. Ibid., pp. 36-38.
138. 'Le sacrement de l'assemblée', IKZ, 46 (1956), pp. 200-213. Henceforth cited as SA.
139. Ibid., p. 210.

140. Ignatius, Ad Eph. 2,2; C. Maurer, Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium (Zurich 1949), p. 93; cited SA, p. 212.
141. 'Statio Orbis', Irén., 35 (1962), pp. 65-75. Cited below as SO.
142. J.A. Jungmann, 'Corpus mysticum', Stimmen der Zeit, 164 (1959).
143. SO, p. 68.
144. Ibid., p. 69.
145. 'Le concile dans la théologie orthodoxe russe', Irén., 35 (1962), pp. 316-339. Henceforth cited as CTOR.
146. Ibid., p. 321.
147. Ibid., p. 336.
148. 'L'infailibilité de l'Eglise du point de vue d'un théologien orthodoxe', in L'Infailibilité de l'Eglise. Journées oecuméniques de Chevetogne 25-29 September 1961 (Chevetogne 1962), pp. 183-201. Cited below as IE.
149. 'Réflexions d'un orthodoxe sur la collégialité des évêques', Mess. Orth., 29-30 (1965), pp. 7-15. Cited below as ROCE.
150. Ibid., p. 10.
151. Ibid., p. 11.
152. Ibid., p. 12.
153. Ibid., p. 13.

154. 'Granitsi Tserkvi', Prav. Mysl., 7 (1949), pp. 17-36.
Cited below as GTs.
155. Ibid., pp. 31 ff.
156. 'Una Sancta', Iren., 36 (1963), pp. 436-475. Cited here as US.
157. 'Apostol Petr i Rimskii episkop', Prav. Mysl., 10 (1955), pp. 7-32; - 'L'apôtre Pierre et l'évêque de Rome', Theol., 26 (1955), pp. 465-475, 620-641. Henceforth cited as APER.
158. 'La doctrine de la primauté à la lumière de l'ecclésiologie', Ist., 4 (1957), pp. 410-420. Here cited as DPLE.
159. 'L'église qui préside dans l'Amour', in N. Afanassieff et al., La Primauté de Pierre dans l'Eglise orthodoxe (Neuchâtel 1960), pp. 7-64. Cited below as EPA.
160. APER, p. 460.
161. O. Cullmann, Saint Pierre. Disciple - Apôtre - Martyr (Neuchâtel-Paris 1952), p. 171.
162. APER, p. 469.
163. O. Cullmann, Christ et le Temps (Neuchâtel-Paris 1947).
164. APER, p. 472.
165. Ibid., p. 473.
166. Afanasev utilizes here F.M. Braun, 'L'arrière-fond judaïque du quatrième Evangile et la communauté de l'Alliance', Revue Biblique, XVII (1955), p. 26.
167. O. Cullmann, Les Sacrements de l'Evangile johannique (Paris 1951), p. 44.

168. APER, p. 475.
169. Ibid., p. 621.
170. Afanasev refers here to Bulgakov's Svv. Petr i Joann. Dva pervoapostola (Paris 1926).
171. APER, p. 637.
172. DPLE, p. 409.
173. Ibid., p. 411.
174. Ibid., p. 412.
175. Ibid., p. 417.
176. Afanasev uses in this connexion J. Ludwig, Die Primatworte Mt XVI.18-19 in der altkirchlicher Exegese (Münster 1952), pp. 33-34.
177. EPA, p. 9.
178. Ibid., p. 11.
179. Ibid., p. 15.
180. Ibid., p. 27.
181. Ibid., p. 28.
182. Ibid., p. 33.
183. Ibid., p. 34.
184. Ibid., p. 64.

Chapter IV - Notes

1. F. E. Vokes, The Riddle of the Didache (London 1938). Vokes re-expressed in fuller form the hypothesis about the Didache's origins suggested by Dom R. H. Connolly, in 'The Didache and Montanism', Downside Review LV (1937), pp. 339-347.
2. Didache xiii; TsDSV p.67
3. Didache xi; xiii; TsDSV p.131.
4. Didache ix, xi TsDSV pp.131-134.
5. F. E. Vokes, The Riddle of the Didache op.cit. p.220.
6. C. Bigg, The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles (London 1898), p.21
7. F. E. Vokes, The Riddle of the Didache op.cit. p.7
8. For Harnack's estimate, see A. Harnack, Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel (Leipzig 1884): a comment on p.94 of this work amply bears out Vokes' strictures on the exaggerations of its first students, 'Die Didache hat uns endlich Licht gebracht'. For Sabatier's study, see A. Sabatier, La Didache ou L'Enseignement des douze apôtres (Paris 1885).
9. F. E. Vokes, The Riddle of the Didache, op.cit. p.135
10. Compare J. Daniélou's division of his The Development of Christian Doctrine up to the Council of Nicaea: volume I being entitled The Theology of Jewish Christianity (London 1964), while volumes II and III are devoted to the Hellenistic and Latin cultural worlds respectively.
11. C. H. Dodd, 'Christian Beginnings. A reply to Dr. Barnes' The Rise of Christianity', London and Holborn Quarterly Review (July 1947), p.8.
12. J. P. Audet, La Didache. Instructions des apôtres (Paris, 1958).
13. Ib. pp. 91-103

14. Ib. pp.121-186.
15. Ib. pp.187-210.
16. See J. M. Ford, 'Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian heresy?' Journal of Ecclesiastical History 17 (1966), pp. 145-158.
- 17.. Judging by his citations, Afanasev accepts the 'middle recension' of Ignatius' letters as argued for by T. Zahn, Ignatius von Antiochien (Gotha 1873) & J. B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers (London 1885). For a discussion of modern attempts to undermine the scholarly consensus after Zahn and Lightfoot, see W. R. Schroedel, 'Are the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch authentic?' Religious Studies Review 6 (1980), pp.196-201.
18. Ignatius, Ad Smyrn 8,2; Ts D SV p.39, c.f. pp.96-7; 232; 245-246.
19. Ignatius, Ad Eph 4,2; Ts D SV p.66.
20. Ignatius, Ad Smyrn 8,1; Ad Magn. 6,1; Ad Trall. 1: Ts D SV pp.232-234.
21. Ignatius, Ad Magn 4.
22. Ts D SV pp.246-262. On the presbyters of Ignatius' church, see A. Vilela, 'Le Presbyterium selon saint Ignace d'Antioche', Bulletin de Littérature chrétienne 74 (1973), pp.161-186.
On the bishop, see especially E. Kauser, 'Tritt der Bischof an die Stelle Christi? Zur Frage nach der Stellung des Bischofs in der Theologie des heiligen Ignatius von Antiochen', in V. Flieder (ed.), Festschrift Franz Loidl zum 65. Geburtstag (Vienna, 1970), I, pp.352-359.
23. Ts D SV pp.253-258.
24. A hypothesis familiarised by W. Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum (Tübingen 1934). For a criticism see H.E.W. Turner, The Pattern of Christian Truth (London, 1954), pp.60-63.

25. E. Massaux, Influence de l'évangile de Saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant Saint Irénée (Louvain 1950), pp.94-135; H. Koester, Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern (Berlin 1957), pp.26-61. See Ignatius, Ad Smyrn 8,2; Ad Eph. 5,2.

26. Ignatius' apparently unprecedented stress on the authority of bishops can be related to his reaction to the 'Judaizers' of Philadelphia and the docetists of Symona: see W. R. Schredel, Ignatius of Antioch (Philadelphia 1985), p.12

"If we are correct that it is Ignatius who polarised these situations, it is no doubt because he saw a threat (real or imagined) to the central significance of suffering (the Lord's and his own) for the Christian way, and because he sensed an independence of mind in his opponents that threatened the unity he regarded as essential to the success of his own martyrdom".

27. Ignatius, Ad Smyrn. 1,2.

28. Ibid. 8,2. But A. Garciadego, Katholikē Ekklēsia: El significado de epíteto 'Catholica' aplicado a 'Iglesia' desde san Ignacio de Antioquía hasta Orígenes (Mexico City 1953) questions whether katholikē here has any immediate geographical reference, preferring to identify its meaning in terms of an idea of organic unity or completeness. W. R. Schoedel speaks of, not a denial of of a geographical catholicity but an 'undifferentiated conception' out of which extensive catholicity will eventually emerge, Ignatius of Antioch, op.cit., p.244.

29. Ignatius, Ad Magn. 3,1.

30. C.f. G. Bareille, 'Ignace d'Antioche', DTC VII.A.col.709. The Letter to the Romans by Dionysius of Corinth (ap. Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica IV 23. 10, C.f. I Clem. 55,2) ascribes to the Roman church a long history of benefactions to the poor and those in mines. This interpretation has recently been revived by W. R. Schoedel, Ignatius of Antioch op.cit., p.166.

31. F. X. Funk, Opera Patrum apostolicorum (Tübingen 1878-1881); I.p. 213.
32. See Ignatius, Ad Trall. 13,1; Ad Rom. 9,3; Ad Philad. 11,2; Ad Smyrn. 12,1.
33. F. X. Funk, Opera Patrum apostolicorum op.cit., sub loc.
34. Ad Rom. Inscr.
35. H. von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries (London 1969), p.98.
36. Ignatius, Ad Eph. 4; Ad Philad. 1,2; Ad Rom. Inscr. and 2,2. Later traditions accredited Ignatius with being a hymn-writer, and even the inventor of antiphonal singing: see M. Viller u. K. Rahner, Ascese und Mystik in der Väterzeit (Freiburg 1939), p.27. There is a congenial intuition here which may be contrasted with an 'architectural' metaphor at work in a monolithic view of the Church's unity.
37. E. van der Grotz, Ignatius von Antiochen als Christ und Theologe (Leipzig 1894), pp.161ff.
38. H. von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries op.cit.p.106.
39. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses III,3,1.
40. J. M. Robinson, 'The Coptic Gnostic Library Today', New Testament Studies XIV (1968), pp. 356-401.
41. F. Sagnard, La Gnose Valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée (Paris 1947), pp. 99-103.
42. Adversus Haereses I. Praef. 2; IV. Praef. 1
43. On this 'biblicism' of Irenaeus, see J. Lawson, The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus (London 1948), pp. 140-198.

44. N. Brox, Offenbarung, Gnosis und Gnostischer Mythos bei Irenaeus von Lyon (Salzburg 1966), pp. 69-104; 133-168.
45. Adversus Haereses III.2. See B. Reynders, 'Paradōsis. Le progrès de l'idée de la tradition jusqu'à saint Irénée', Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 5 (1933), pp. 155-191 for the concept of tradition in Irenaeus vis-à-vis his predecessors.
46. Adversus Haereses III.4
47. Ib. III.3.
48. EPA p. 55.
49. F. M. Sagnard, Irénée de Lyons, Contre les Hérésies III. Sources Chrétiennes 54 (Paris 1952), pp.414 ff.
50. EPA p. 56.
51. Tertullian, De pudicitia 21,17: Ipsa ecclesia proprie et principaliter est Spiritus.
52. See W. Ullmann, A History of Political Thought: the Middle Ages (London 1965), pp.20 ff.
53. For the classic statement of Tertullian's profound legal learning, see A. Beck, Römische Recht bei Tertullian und Cyprian (Halle 1930; 1967), pp.13-105. For the counter-case, see T. D. Barnes, Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study (Oxford 1971), pp.22-29.
54. TsDSV pp.1-3.
55. See R.F. Evans, One and Holy. The Church in Latin Patristic Thought (London 1971) pp. 5-20.
56. See H. Musurillo, The Acts of the Christian Martyrs (Oxford 1972), pp. 106-131; T. D. Barnes, Tertullian op.cit. pp. 77-80

57. De fuga 14,3. On the religious sensibility of the Passio, see E. H. Dodds, Pagan and Christian in an age of Anxiety (Cambridge 1965), pp.47-53.
58. On Montanism in general, P. de Labriolle, La Crise Montaniste (Paris 1913).
59. That is, according to Tertullian himself, Adversus Praxean 1,4.
60. De pudicitia 21,17.
61. In writing, for example, the Adversus Hermogenem, the Adversus Marcionem and the De praescriptione haereticorum, Tertullian's mind began to focus more on theological issues so that in the words of T. D. Barnes, Tertullian op.cit.p.121, he was led on to 'a systematic exploration of theology'. Barnes considers that it was indeed 'during the composition of his vast disquisitions on problems raised by Gnostics and by Marcion that he had come to accept the New Prophecy', ib.p.129.
62. In a group of late treatises, the De ieiunio, De monogamia, De virginis velandis and De pudicitia, Tertullian defended what he took to be the practice of the apostolic age against innovations introduced by those who would not accept the New Prophecy.
63. C.f. De anima 58,8: De resurrectione mortuorum 63, 7 ff. De fuga 14,3.
64. J. Steinmann, Tertullien (Paris 1967), p.285.
65. Ad martyres 1; 3
66. J. Steinmann, Tertullien op.cit. p.287.
67. See below, and, in general, R. A. Markus, Saeculum. History and Society in the Theology of Saint Augustine (Cambridge 1970).

68. De praescriptione haereticorum 22. The peculiar stress of Tertullian on the Spirit in ecclesiology is noted by A. d'Alès, La Théologie de Tertullien (Paris 1905), p. 215.
- 69 E.g. Aphraates, De virginitate contra Judaeos 18,10; G. M. Hopkins, 'The Blessed Virgin compared to the Air we Breathe', The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins (London 1967), pp. 93-97.
- 70 K. Delehaye, Ecclesia Mater chez les Pères des trois premiers siècles (Paris 1964), p. 19.
- 71 Crigen, In Levit. IX.1; TsDSv p. 40.
- 72 In Josue VII.2; TsDSv p. 73
- 73 In Matt. XII.14; TsDSv p. 41. C.f. In Matt. XXIV; TsDSv p. 100; J. Daniélou, Origène (Paris 1948²), p. 83.
- 74 In Matt. XI.14; In Num. XVI.19; TsDSv p. 59; J. Daniélou, Origène op.cit. pp. 74ff.
- 75 In Matt. XVI.8; TsDSv p. 141.
- 76 TsDSv p. 134.
- 77 G. Bardy, 'Origène', DTC XI.B. col. 1553.
- 78 In Matt. XIII.24
- 79 In Genes. XII.3
- 80 Ibid. II.3-6.
- 81 In Cant. Cant. I.7.
- 82 TsDSv p. 135.
- 83 H. von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries op.cit. p. 249.
- 84 Ibid. pp. 249-250.

85. C.f. G. W. Olsen, 'The theologian and the magisterium. The ancient and mediaeval background of a contemporary controversy', Communio 7 (1980), pp. 292-319. On Origen's concept of the didaskalos see C. V. Harris, Origen of Alexandria's Interpretation of the Teacher's Function in the Early Christian Hierarchy and Community (New York 1966).
- 86 In Num. II.1; In Jer. XI.3; In Luc. XX.
- 87 In Matt. XII
- 88 H. von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries op.cit. p. 254.
- 89 J. W. Trigg, Origen. The Bible and philosophy in the third-century Church (London 1985), pp. 103-120.
- 90 H. G. Beck, Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich (Munich 1959), pp. 360-361.
- 91 TsDSv p. 19.
- 92 EPA pp. 16-25.
- 93 DIVTs pp. 17-19.
- 94 Ibid. p.20.
- 95 See R. Farina, L'Impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Caesarea. La prima teologia politica del cristianesimo (Zurich 1966).
- 96 W. H. C. Frend, The Donatist Church. A movement of protest in Roman North Africa (Oxford 1952), pp. 106-110.
- 97 F. van der Meer, Augustine the Bishop (London 1961), pp. 471-492.
- 98 R. F. Evans, One and Holy op.cit. p. 9.
- 99 Tertullian, De oratione 2.
- 100 R. F. Evans, One and Holy op.cit. pp. 10-16.

- 101 Jerome, Liber de viris illustribus 53
- 102 R. F. Evans, One and Holy op.cit. p. 19.
- 103 Ibid. pp. 24-26.
- 104 C.f. De praescriptione haereticorum 15; 20f.; 28; 32; 36f.
- 105 Cyprian, Epp. 33,1; 68,2,3; 69,9; 76,3,6.
- 106 Thus R. F. Evans could write, 'The Church as an object of reflection attains a new kind of significance in Cyprian', One and Holy op.cit. p. 48. This could, but need not, be taken in an Afanasevan way.
- 107 A. Demoustier S.J., 'Episcopat et union à Rome selon saint Cyprien', Rech. Sc. Rel. 52 (1964), pp. 337-369.
- 108 Ibid., 'L'ontologie de l'Eglise selon saint Cyprien', ib. pp. 554- 588.
- 109 For the chronology of Cyprian's writings, see P. Monceaux, Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne II (Paris 1902).
- 110 Ep. 3.
- 111 Epp. 33; 43.
- 112 Epp. 24; 55
- 113 A. Demoustier, 'Episcopat et union à Rome selon saint Cyprien', art. cit. p. 343.
- 114 Ibid. p. 345.
- 115 Ep. 72,3.
- 116 De unitate Ecclesiae 5
- 117 Ep. 55,4; cited DIVTs p. 17.
- 118 Ad Fortunatum 2; De unitate Ecclesiae 4; 5.

- 119 A. Demoustier, 'Episcopat et union à Rome selon saint Cyprien', art.cit. pp. 351-352.
- 120 DIVTs pp. 19-20.
- 121 C.f. E. H. Benson, Cyprian: his life, times and work (London 1897), pp. 180-197.
- 122 Ep. 55,8: 'locus Petri'.
- 123 Ep. 59,14: 'cathedra Petri'.
- 124 Ep. 48,3: ecclesiae catholicae matricem et radicem agnoscerent et tenerent'.
- 125 Ep. 73.
- 126 J. Chapman, O.S.B., 'Les interpolations dans le traité de saint Cyprien sur l'unité de l'Eglise', Revue Bénédictine 20 (1903), pp. 26-52.
- 127 A. Demoustier, 'L'ontologie de l'Eglise selon saint Cyprien', art. cit. p. 5701 c.f. Cyprian, Ep. 63,13.
- 128 Thus De unitate Ecclesiae 5 picks up the imagery of Tertullian, Adversus Praxean 8.
- 129 A. Demoustier, 'L'ontologie de l'Eglise selon saint Cyprien', art. cit. pp. 587-588.
- 130 TsDSv pp. 283-288; 296-297.
- 131 F. Dvornik, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy (Washington 1966).
- 132 Ibid. I. p. 249.
- 133 On Philo: Dvornik remarks that he absorbed into his political scheme all the elements of the Hellenistic doctrine of kingship save deification itself: see, e.g., De specialibus legibus IV. 187; De vita Moysi II.5. On Clement's Christianising of such notions, see F. Dvornik, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy op. cit. II. p. 600.

- 134 See especially Eusebius, De laudibus Constantini 2.
- 135 C.f. F. Dvornik, 'Emperors, popes and councils', DOP 6 (1951), pp. 1-23.
- 136 The Arian crisis, wherein Constantius frequently found himself on the 'wrong side', was also a major factor in the cooling of Eusebian-inspired ardour for the concept of the Christian basileus: c.f. Athanasius, Historia Arianorum 44.
- 137 See G. Ostrogrosky, 'The Byzantine emperor and the hierarchical world order', Slavonic and East European Review 35 (1956-7), pp. 1-14.
- 138 F. H. Dudden, The Life and Times of Saint Ambrose (London 1935), II. pp. 371-392.
- 139 Augustine, De catechezandis rudibus 27; 53; c.f. R. A. Markus, Saeculum op.cit. pp. 32-33.
- 140 J. J. O'Meara, The Young Augustine (London 1954), pp. 61-91.
- 141 See, e.g., Ep. 140; c.f. G. G. Willis, Saint Augustine and the Donatist Controversy (London 1950).
- 142 R. F. Evans, One and Holy op.cit. p. 121.
- 143 R. A. Markus, Saeculum op.cit. pp. 13-21.
- 144 See De civitate Dei X.20; c.f. G. Bonner, 'The Church and the Eucharist in the theology of Saint Augustine', Sob. (1978), pp. 448-461.
- 145 R. A. Markus, Saeculum op.cit. pp. 61-62. The reference is to G. M. Hopkins, 'Spelt from Sibyl's Leaves', The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins op.cit. pp. 97-98.
- 146 R. T. Wallis, Neoplatonism (London 1972), pp. 160-161.
- 147 R. Roques, L'Univers dionysien. Structure hiérarchique du monde selon le Pseudo-Denys (Paris 1954; 1983) pp. 36-67.

- 148 Denys, De hierarchia ecclesiastica II.1.
- 149 TsDSv p. 19; c.f. pp. 4; 29; 34.
- 150 De hierarchia ecclesiastica I.2.
- 151 Ibid. I.4.
- 152 Ibid. I.2.
- 153 Ibid. I.3..
- 154 Y. Congar O.P., 'Les saints Pères: organes privilégiés de la tradition', Iren. 35 (1962), pp. 479-498. The basic meaning of 'fathers', according to Congar, is:
ceux qui ont déterminé quelque chose dans
la vie de l'Eglise, soit quant à sa foi, soit
quant à sa discipline ou son comportement.
(ibid. p. 483). But there can be no authentic
determination of the Church's life, Congar continues,
without positing the special grace of the Spirit.
- 155 This tendency has been traced in Chapter III above:
emerging in DIVTs it was developed in TsDSv and reached
its most combative statement in EPA.
- 156 Particularly stressed in the school of hermeneutics
associated with H. G. Gadamer: v. Wahrheit und Methode
(Tübingen 1960), pp. 185-228. An application to the
New Testament situation may be found in F. Mussner, The
Historical Jesus in the Gospel of John (London 1967). For
a statement in terms of fundamental theology see A.
Louth, Discerning the Mystery. An essay in the nature of
theology (Oxford 1983), pp. 17-44.
- 157 It is surprising that Afanasev draws so little on the
copious pre-Revolutionary Russian patristic monographs
described in C. Kern, Les traductions russes des textes
patristiques. Guide bibliographique (Chevetogne 1957).
- 158 For the significance of the term 'canon' see J. Gaudemet,
Les Sources du droit de l'Eglise en Occident du IIe au VIIe

- siècle (Paris 1985), pp. 11-12. Early canons were frequently simply sanctionings of custom whose own authority is first discussed in Tertullian: see De virginibus velandis 1; De corona 3,5; 4,6-7.
- 159 C. de Clercq, 'Byzantin (droit canonique)', DDC II (Paris 1957), col. 1170.
- 160 On the origins of canon law see O. Heggelbacher, Geschichte des frühchristlichen Kirchenrechts bis zum Konzil von Nizäa, 325 (Fribourg 1974).
- 161 A. Faivre, 'La documentation canonico-liturgique de l'Eglise ancienne', Rev. Sc. Rel. LIV (1980), pp. 204-215.
- 162 M. Metzger, 'Constitutions apostoliques', Revue de Droit Canonique XXXII (1982), pp. 141-142.
- 163 The fullest account is B. Benešević, Sinagoga v 50 titulov i drugie iuridičeskie sborniki Joanni Skholastika (St Petersburg 1914).
- 164 C.f. E. Herman, S.J., 'The secular Church', in J. M. Hussey (ed.), The Byzantine Empire. II: Government, Church and civilisation (Cambridge 1967), p. 106.
- 165 C. de Clercq, 'Byzantin (droit canonique)', art. cit. col. 1174.
- 166 See A. Michel, Die Kaisermacht in der Ostkirche (Darmstadt 1959).
- 167 E.g. Vita Theodori 31, cited A. Michel, *ibid.*, p.8; Nicephorus of Constantinople, Ep. ad papam Leonem III (= M.P.G. 100, 197B), cited A. Michel, *op.cit.* pp. 90 and 155ff.
- 168 Obvious examples are: Zeno's Menotikon; Justinian's condemnation of the 'Three Chapters'; Heraclius' Ekthēsis; Leo III's edict against the images.
- 169 M.P.G. 113, 456.
- 170 Novellae 6; 42

- 171 J. de Malafosse, 'Epanagōgē', DDC V (1953), cols. 354-362.
- 172 TsDSv pp. 281-288.
- 173 Ibid. pp. 292-303.
- 174 E. Herman, S.J., 'Balsamon (Théodore)', DDC II. op.cit. col. 76.
- 175 C. de Clercq, 'Byzantin (Droit canonique)', art. cit. col. 1174.
- 176 Balsamon, Commentary on Canon 58 of the Council in Trullo, cited TsDSv p. 46.
- 177 Balsamon, Commentary on Canon 69 of the Council in Trullo, cited TsDSv p. 42.
- 178 Cited TsDSv p.52.
- 179 Balsamon, Commentary on Apostolic Canon 9, cited TsDSv pp. 54-55.
- 180 Basil, Ep. 113.
- 181 TsDSv p. 56,
- 182 Balsamon, Responsio ad Marcum patriarchum Alexandriae 17 (= M.P.G. 138, 968).
- 183 E. Herman, S.J., 'Jean Zonaras', DDC VI cols. 129-130.
- 184 Zonaras, Commentary on Canon 69 of the Council in Trullo, cited TsDSv p. 42.
- 185 Ibid. p. 54.
- 186 For a brief overview, see J. Hussey, The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire (Oxford 1986), pp. 304-310.
- 187 L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit op.cit. p. 350.
- 188 R. Sohm, Kirchenrecht I (Leipzig 1892), p.1.

- 189 H. —J. Schmitz, Frühkatholizismus bei Adolf von Harnack, Rudolph Sohm und Ernst Käsemann (Düsseldorf 1977), pp. 94-104.
- 190 R. Zom, Tserkovnoi stroi v pervie veka Khristianstva, per. A. Petrovskago i P. Florenskago (Moscow 1906)
- 191 P. Florovsky, Stolp i utverzdenie istinnu (Moscow 1914), p. 755.
- 192 S. N. Bulgakov, Pravoslavie (Paris 1965), p. 100: 'Ierarkhiya i tainstva', Put 49 (1935), pp. 24-33; more positively, in the early study, 'O pervokhristianstve' originally 1908, in Dva grada (Moscow 1911), I. p. 275.
- 193 R. Sohm, Kirchenrecht op.cit. p. 18.
- 194 Ibid. pp. 19-20.
- 195 R. Sohm, Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus (Leipzig 1909; Berlin 1912), p. 68.
- 196 R. Sohm, Kirchenrecht op.cit. p. 257.
- 197 C.f. J. Darrouzes, 'Conférence sur la primauté du pape à Constantinople en 1357', Revue des études byzantines 19 (1961), pp. 76-109.
- 198 S. Świerkosz, L'Eglise visible selon S. Bulgakov. Structure hiérarchique et sacramentelle (Rome 1980), pp. 19-20. However, Bulgakov later reverted to a more Khomiakovian stress on sobornost, describing his middle period as that when he felt closest to Catholicism: Avtobiografičeskiya zametki (Paris 1946), p. 49.
- 199 Sohm appears to have been much influenced by E. Rietschl, Luthers Anschauung von unsichtbarer und sichtbarer Kirche (Leipzig 1900). See Y. Congar, 'R. Sohm nous interroge encore', RSPT 57 (1973), p. 264. Congar considers that underlying Sohm's approach is 'une sorte d'apollinarisme ecclésiologique': as the Logos incarnate for Apollinaris lacked a rational soul so for Sohm the Church of the Word Incarnate lacks a proper social form: ibid. p. 277.

200. Afanasev's claim that Christian antiquity did not know the distinction between unchangeable and changeable features in the canons was too hastily made: see E. Rosser, Göttliches und Menschliches, Unveränderliches und Veränderliches Kirchenrecht von der Entstehung der Kirche bis zur Mitte des 9. Jahrhunderts (Paderborn 1934).

Chapter V - Notes

- *. For an overview of the present condition of this rapprochement, see R. Barringer, O.S.B., 'Catholic-Orthodox dialogue: the present position', in Rome and Constantinople. Essays in the dialogue of love (Brookline, Mass. 1984).
1. P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche, op. cit., p. 63.
 2. P. Coppens, 'L'Eucharistie, sacrement et sacrifice de la nouvelle Alliance: fondement de l'Eglise', in J. Giblest (ed.), Aux origines de l'Eglise (Paris 1965), pp. 125-158.
 3. R.E. Brown, S.S., The Gospel according to John: i-xii (New York 1966), pp. 257-304; F.-M. Braun, 'Quatre 'signes' johanniques de l'unité chrétienne', New Testament Studies, 9 (1962-3), especially pp. 147-148.
 4. R.E. Brown, S.S., The Gospel according to John: xiii-xxi (New York 1966), pp. 672-674; B. Sandvik, 'Johannes 15 als Abendmahltext', Theologische Zeitschrift, 23 (1967), pp. 323-328. C.f. J.M. Tillard, O.P., L'Eucharistie, pâques de l'Eglise (Paris 1964), p. 39, seeing the Johannine verb menein as the key to a fundamental soteriology contextualising the Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel:
Le fidèle communie aux biens du Père ... par la médiation de sa demeure en Jésus, lui-même communion vivante et transcendante à celui dont il est le Fils à un titre tout particulier, rendu capable (par son sacrifice pascal) de conduire ses frères à une participation authentique à sa propre plénitude.
 5. O. Cullmann, Les Sacrements dans l'évangile Johannique. La vie de Jésus et le culte de l'Eglise primitive (Paris 1951), pp. 73-76.

6. Ibid., pp. 81-83; c.f. M.-J. Lagrange, Évangile selon saint Jean (Paris 1948), pp. 499-500.
7. A. Feuillet, The Apocalypse (New York 1984), pp. 85-88.
8. B. Forte, La Chiesa nell'Eucaristia (Naples 1975), p.
9. J. Tillard, O.P., L'Eucharistie, pâques de l'Eglise, op. cit., p. 46. See also L. Cerfaux, La Théologie de l'Eglise suivant saint Paul (Paris 1948), pp. 201-218, 243-258, 276, 280; Le Christ dans la théologie de saint Paul (Paris 1954), pp. 264-268, 320-322; L. Halevez, 'L'Eglise Corps du Christ, sens et provenance de l'expression chez saint Paul', Recherches de Science Religieuse (1944), pp. 27-94.
10. P. Benoit, 'Corps tête et plérôme dans les épîtres de la Captivité', Exégèse et théologie, II (Paris 1961), pp. 107-153.
11. L. Cerfaux, La Théologie de l'Eglise suivant saint Paul, op. cit., p. 212; c.f. A.D.J. Rawlinson, 'Corpus Christi', in G.A. Bell and A. Deissmann (ed.), Mysterium Christi (London 1930), pp. 225 ff.
12. H. de Lubac, S.J., Corpus mysticum: l'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au moyen âge (Paris 1939-44; 1948), p. 23.
13. Augustine, Sermo 272; c.f. Sermo 72, 7; 127; In Iohannis evangelium tractatus, CXXIV, tract. 27. c.6.
14. H. de Lubac, S.J., Corpus mysticum, op. cit., pp. 23-46.
15. Ibid., p. 33.
16. See R. McKitterick, The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms 789-895 (London 1977), pp. 151-3.

17. On the dating of Paschasius' work, see the introduction to the edition of his De corpore et sanguine Domini by B. Paulus (Turnhout 1969), pp. vii-x. For his theology, see G. Macy, The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period (Oxford 1984), pp. 27-31; and on its continuing influence, *ibid.*, pp. 44-72.

18. Contrast a comment of F. van der Meer on Augustine's Eucharistic theology:

Il découvre l'union réelle avec le Christ, non pas tant à travers la présence réelle, mais à travers le signe, et cette union n'est pas tant l'union individuelle que celle des individus entre eux dans le Christ.

F. van der Meer, 'Sacramentum chez saint Augustin', La Maison-Dieu, 13 (1948), p. 61; c.f. P. Bertocchi, Il simbolismo ecclesiologico dell'Eucaristia in S. Agostino (Bergamo 1931). While denying that such authors are 'dynamists' or 'symbolists' in the explicitly restrictive sense of the words that dogmatic historians give them (contrast here the language of the sacramentaries used in their period), H. de Lubac maintains that nevertheless for them the unity of the body they receive in communion is the sign and gage of the unity of that body which they themselves form. Hence the description of the Eucharist as mysterium unitatis, sacramentum conjunctionis, federationis, adunationis: see Corpus mysticum, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-7, and E. Janot, 'L'Eucharistie dans les sacramentaires occidentaux', Recherches de science religieuse 17 (1927) pp.5-24.

19. M. Gibson, Lanfranc of Bec (Oxford 1978), pp. 63-97; J.R. Geiselmann, Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik (Paderborn 1926), pp. 290-406. On the emergence of a theological metaphysic of the Eucharist, see H. Jorisson, Die Entfaltung der Transsubstantiationslehre bis zu der Hochscholastik (Münster 1965).

20. G. Macy, The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period, op. cit., pp. 106-132.
21. See N. Häring, 'Die Sententie magistri gisleberti pictavensis episcopi', Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge, 45 (1978), pp. 83-183; 46 (1979), pp. 95-105. On Gilbert himself, see H.C. van Elswijk, Gilbert Porreta. Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée (Louvain 1966).
22. P. Classen, Gerhoh von Reichersberg. Eine Biographie mit einem Anhang über die Quellen, ihre handschriftliche Überlieferung und ihre Chronologie (Wiesbaden 1960), pp. 126-127; H. de Lubac, 'La res sacramenti chez Gerhoh de Reichersberg', Études de critique et d'histoire religieuses (Lyon 1948), pp. 35-42.
23. R. Hermanns, Petri Abaelardi eiusque primae scholae doctrina de sacramentis (Mecheln 1965); G. Macy, The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period, op. cit., pp. 114-118.
24. Macy, op. cit., p. 121.
25. Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis episcopi Sententiae in IV libris distinctae, l. 4. d. 8. cc. 6-7.
26. On Amalarius' career, see G. Morin, 'Amalaire de Metz', DTC, I.1, cols. 933-4; the comparison with the Byzantine notions of the elements prior to consecration as images of Christ's body and the tradition of Byzantine mystagogiae is made by D. Stone, in A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (London 1909), I, p. 210.
27. J. de Ghellinck, S.J., 'Eucharistie au XIIe siècle en Occident', DTC, V.2, col. 1250.

28. Thus F. Holböck in his Der eucharistische und der mystische Leib Christi. in ihren Beziehungen zueinander nach der Lehre der Frühscholastik (Rome 1941); B. Forte, La Chiesa nell'Eucaristia, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

29. Consult here the study of P.H.Chroust, 'The corporate idea and the body politic in the Middle Ages', Review of Politics, 9 (1947), pp. 403-422; for Thomas' use of such conceptions, see A. Darquennes, De juridische Structuur van de Kerk volgens s. Thomas van Aquin (Leuven 1949), pp. 127-154; and in the constitutional pattern of the Order of Preachers, E. Barker, The Dominican Order and Convocation. A study of the growth of representation in the Church during the thirteenth century (Oxford 1933). Perhaps the most perspicuous example of the trend is, however, John of Paris: see J. Leclerq, Jean de Paris et l'ecclésiologie du XIIIe siècle (Paris 1943).

30. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, IIIa.q.23, a.1, ad 11.

31. Ibid., IIIa. q.69, a.2; 3; 4 & 6.

32. Ibid., IIIa. q.73, a.3.

33. H.M. Bouessé, 'La causalité efficiente instrumentale de l'humanité du Christ et des sacrements chrétiens', Revue Thomiste (1934), pp. 370-393; (1938), pp. 256-298; C.E. O'Neill, 'The Mysteries of Christ and the sacraments', The Thomist (1962), pp. 1-53; also of immediate relevance here is the re-presentation of these notions in Odo Casel's Mysterientheologie, on which see T. Filthaut, La Théologie des Mystères (Paris 1954).

34. IIIa. q.8, a.1, ad 1; 48, a.6; 50, a.6; 51, a.1; 62, 5 ad 1 etc.

35. IIIa. q.56, a.1 ad 111.

36. J. Tillard, L'Eucharistie, pâque de l'Eglise, op. cit., p. 70.
37. J. Tillard, 'La triple dimension du signe sacramentel', Nouvelle Revue Théologique (1961), pp. 225-254.
38. A.-M. Roguet, 'L'Unité du Corps mystique dans la charité: res sacramenti de l'eucharistie', La Maison-Dieu, 24 (1950), pp. 20-45.
39. IIIa. q.73, a.1 ad iii; a.3; q. 83. a.4.
40. J. Hamer, L'Eglise est une communion (Paris 1962), p. 84; c.f. IIIa. q.67, a.2; q.73, a.3. Hamer's comment is by way of contribution to the debate over Thomas' use of corpus mysticum language. A. Mitterer in his Geheimnisvoller Leib Christi nach S. Thomas von Aquin und nach Papst Pius XII (Vienna 1950) had argued that the phrase designates for Thomas, by and large, the invisible Church. His stress on the interior and spiritual nature of the gratia Christi produces a discarnate ecclesiology. Hamer concludes, however, that the theological foundation of the mystical body in Thomas is the fulness of grace of Jesus Christ 'comme support instrumentel de la causalité divine de grâce et de salut', p. 79. Though for Thomas as for Augustine all the just belong to the Church, Christ is man's caput, body and soul: c.f. IIIa. q.8, a.2, and here 'la corporéité se réalise selon les états de l'Eglise, selon ses âges': thus the 'sacraments' of the Old Law belong to the Church-in-formation, IIIa. q.8, a.3, ad iii; q.61, a.3, q.80, a.1.
41. IIIa. q.7, a.9; on the nature of Trinitarian 'appropriation' in Thomas, see P.H. Dondaine, La Trinité II (Paris 1950), pp. 409-423.
42. Thomas, In Joannem, 13, lect. 6.
43. IIIa. q.48, a.6, ad ii.

44. In Joannem, 7, lect. 3/5.

45. In Joannem, 6, lect. 7. C.f. E. Vauthier, 'Le Saint-Esprit, principe de l'unité de l'Eglise d'après S. Thomas d'Aquin. Corps mystique et inhabitation du Saint-Esprit', Mélanges de Science Religieuse, 5 (1948), pp. 175-196; 6 (1949), 57-80. The Spirit is presented as the agent of the eucharistic conversion in IV Sent. d.8, q.2 a.3 ad 1. On the seriousness of the comparative absence of references to the Spirit in this connexion see Y.M.-J. Congar, 'Pneumatologie ou "christomonisme" dans la tradition latine?', Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis, 45 (1969), pp. 394-416.

46. Concilium Tridentinum, Sessio 13, c.2, 8.

47. J. Simon, O.S.B., 'L'Eucharistie, sacrement d'unité', Revue Thomiste, 20 (1912), pp. 583-4.

48. The phrase is drawn from the official designation of the correspondence between Rome and Constantinople initiated by John XXIII and Athenagoras I. See Tomos Agapēs: Vatican-Phanar 1958-1970 (Rome 1971). For its non-theological significance see P. Duprey, 'La Théologie et le rapprochement entre les Églises catholique et orthodoxe', in Théologie en acte. Mélanges Congar (Paris 1984), pp. 37-50.

49. Lumen Gentium, 3; 7; 11. B. Forte's study of the Council speeches and texts in this light stresses six motifs: Eucharist and Church in the constitution on the sacred Liturgy; Eucharist and mystery of Church; Eucharist and people of God; Eucharist and the Church's structure; Eucharist and holiness; Eucharist, eschatology and the Church in the world: La Chiesa nell'Eucaristia, op. cit., pp. 171-314.

50. E.g. John Chrysostom, Hom. 24 in I. Cor., PG 61, 200.

51. Cyril of Alexandria, In Joannem, 11, 11; PG 74, 560.
C.f. ibid., Dialogus de Trinitate, PG 75, 695.
52. R. Bornert, Les Commentaires byzantins de la divine liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle (Paris 1966); c.f. F. Kattenbusch, 'Mystagogische Theologie', in Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, XIII (1903), pp. 612-622.
53. H.U. von Balthasar, Kosmische Liturgie. Das Weltbild Maximus des Bekenners (Einsiedeln 1961²), pp. 363 ff.
54. Y. Congar, L'Église. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne (Paris 1970), p. 70.
55. For Germanus' treatise, see PG 98, 384-453; F.E. Brightman, 'The Historia mystagogica and other Greek commentaries on the Byzantine liturgy', Journal of Theological Studies, 9 (1907-8), pp. 248-267, 387-397.
56. For Nicholas of Andida's work, see PG 140, 413-468; and R. Bornert, Les commentaires byzantins de la divine liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle, op. cit., pp. 206-210.
57. Cited R. Bornert, op. cit., p. 26.
58. Y. Congar, L'Eglise. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne, op. cit., p. 71. But c.f. A. Louth's judgment that 'in Kavasilas ... we can find not just the full content of Dionysian spirituality which holds in balance the individual and the community, the Liturgy and the heart's search for God, but a development of this which shows Kavasilas to be a true scribe of the Kingdom of Heaven, bringing forth out of his treasure things new and old', 'The influence of Denys the Areopagite in Eastern and Western spirituality in the fourteenth century', Sobornost, IV.2 (1982), pp. 199-200.

59. K.C. Felmy, Die Deutung der Göttlichen Liturgie in der russischen Theologie (Berlin-New York 1984).
60. A. Schmemmann, '"Unity", "division", "reunion" in the light of Orthodox ecclesiology', Theologia (A) 22 (1951), pp. 24-254; 'The Eucharist and the doctrine of the Church', St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, 2 (1954), pp. 7-12.
61. P. Evdokimov, L'Orthodoxie (Neuchâtel-Paris 1959), pp. 128-130.
62. J. Meyendorff, 'Sacraments et hiérarchie dans l'Eglise', Dieu Vivant, 26 (1954), pp. 81-91; 'The Orthodox Concept of Church', St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, NF 6 (1962), pp. 59-71.
63. J. Zizioulas, Hē henotēs tēs Ekklesiās en tē theia Eucharistia kai tō Episkopō kata tous treis prōtous aionas (Athens 1965); 'La communauté eucharistique et la Catholicité de l'Eglise', Istina, 14 (1969), pp. 67-68, = 'The Eucharistic Community and the Catholicity of the Church', One in Christ (OC), 6 (1970), pp. 314-337.
64. Y. Congar, Diversity and Communion (London 1984); see also T.I. McDonald, The Ecclesiology of Yves Congar: foundational themes (Lanham, Md. 1984).
65. J. Hamer, L'Eglise est une communion, op. cit.
66. E. Lanne, 'L'Eglise locale et l'Eglise universelle', Irenikon, 43 (1970), pp. 481-511.
67. L. Bouyer, L'Eglise de Dieu. Corps du Christ et temple de l'Esprit (Paris 1970).
68. H.-J. Schulz, 'Entwurf einer eucharistischen Ekklesiologie aus der gemeinsamen liturgischen Überlieferung der Kirchen des Ostens und des Westens', Kyrios, NF 13 (1973), pp. 101-118.

69. B. Forte, La Chiesa nell'Eucaristia, op. cit.
70. 'Le Mystère de l'Église et de l'Eucharistie à la lumière du mystère de la Sainte Trinité', 4b-c: = Iren. 55 (1982), p. 352.
71. J.D. Zizioulas, 'The Eucharistic community and the Catholicity of the Church', art. cit., p. 324; the reference is to Peri Hermeneias, 7, 17.
72. E.g. I Cor. 1, 2; II Cor. 2, 1; Ignatius, Ad Philadelphenos; Martyrdom of Polycarp, prol.
73. For the more 'absolute' use in Paul, see I Cor. 12, 28; 15, 5; Gal. 1, 13, as well as Colossians and Ephesians, passim.
74. Y. Congar, 'La Collégialité de l'épiscopat', in L'Episcopat et l'Eglise universelle (Paris 1962), I, p. 19.
75. Peter Damian, Opusculum 11, Liber qui dicit 'Dominus vobiscum', 5 = PL 145, 235c; b.6, = PL 145, 235d. See on this J. Leclercq, S. Pierre Damien, ermite et homme d'Eglise (Rome 1960).
76. J. Ratzinger, 'The pastoral implications of episcopal collegiality', Concilium, 1 (1965), p. 22.
77. H. de Lubac, Les Églises particulières dans l'Église universelle (Paris 1971), p. 53.
78. This is the burden of J.D. Zizioulas' critique of Afanasev in Hē henotēs tes Ekklesiās en tē Theia Eucharistia kai tō Episkopō kata tous treis prōtous aiōnas, op. cit. pp. 17-18.
79. Y. Congar, L'Eglise. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne, op. cit., p. 40.

80. Augustine, Contra Cresconium, III.52-4, PL 43, 527-30.
81. A. Gréa, L'Eglise et sa divine constitution (Paris 1965²), pp. 68-70.
82. H.M. Legrand, 'Inversus Babel', Spiritus, 43 (1970), pp. 528-9.
83. The word homonoia occurs about fifteen times in Clement of Rome; c.f. A. Jaubert, Sources Chrétiennes, 167, pp. 34-5; for Ignatius, see Ad Ephesenses, 4, 1.
84. See J. Lécuyer, Études sur la collégialité épiscopale (Le Puy 1964), p. 56.
85. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, IV.26, 2; Sources Chrétiennes, 100, II, p. 718; on this see L. Ligier, 'Le charisma veritatis certum des évêques, ses attaches liturgiques, patristiques et bibliques', in ibid., L'Homme devant Dieu (Paris 1963), I, pp. 247-268.
86. Origen, In Jesu Nave, hom. 7, 6; MPG 12, 861-2.
87. Cited by G. Dejaifve, 'Conciliarité au Concile du Vatican', Nouvelle Revue Théologique, 82 (1960), p. 796.
88. Documentation Catholique, LXXVI.1738 (19.3.1978), p. 264.
89. C.f. L. Coenen, 'Zeugnis', Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament, II.2 (Wuppertal 1971), pp. 1478-1486.
90. J. Ratzinger, 'Anglican-Catholic dialogue: its problems and hopes', Insight, I.3 (March 1983).
91. J. Tillard, 'Christian Communion', The Tablet, Vol. 238, No. 7488 (14.1.1984), pp. 39-40; c.f. B. Schultze, 'Der Primat Petri und seiner Nachfolger nach den Grundsätzen der universellen und der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie', Orientalia Christiana Periodica 31 (1965), pp. 21-52,

277-294

92. Lumen Gentium, 26; c.f. Christus Dominus, 11.
93. J. Hamer, L'Église est une communion, op. cit., p. 37.
94. L. Morren, 'Un aspect du problème du signe: la complémentarité généralisée', Recherches et débats, 67 (1969), pp. 137-141.
95. Y. Congar, Diversity and Communion (London 1984), p. 76.
96. J. Colson, L'Évêque dans les communautés primitives. Tradition paulinienne et tradition johannique de l'épiscopat, des origines à saint Irénée (Paris 1951), p. 59.
97. Ibid., p. 86.
98. John 15, 1-10; 14, 16 and 26; 15, 26; 16, 7-8; 17, 18. In 17, 20 Jesus distinguishes the object of his prayer from 'those also who will believe in me through their word', thus showing that the High Priestly Prayer is offered in the first place for the Twelve. Admittedly, for the New Testament as a whole 'the apostles' form a larger group than the Twelve, yet figures subsequently commissioned as Church founders must be in substantial solidarity with the Twelve: see P. Grelot, Église et ministères (Paris 1983), pp. 21-27.
99. Acts 1, 15-26; c.f. 1, 8.
100. B. Botte, 'La collégialité dans le Nouveau Testament et chez les pères apostoliques', in Le Concile et les conciles (Chevetogne 1960), p. 7.
101. Acts 6, 1-6; 1, 1-35: on the historicity of the Jerusalem meeting see P. Gaechter, 'Geschichtliches zum Apostelkonzil', Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 85 (1963).

102. Galatians 2, 1-5; I Cor. 12, 28; c.f. Eph. 2, 19-20.
103. Apoc. 21, 14.
104. Tit. 1, 5.
105. I Clem. 44.
106. Irenaeus, apud Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, V, 24, 16-17.
107. Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica, IV, 22, 1.
108. J. Lebreton, 'Le développement des institutions ecclésiastiques à la fin du second siècle et au début du troisième', Recherches de science religieuse, 24 (1934), pp. 158-161.
109. B. Botte, 'Presbyterium et ordo episcoporum', Irénikon, 29 (1956), pp. 5-27.
110. H. Marot, 'Conciles anténicéens et concile oecuméniques', in Le Concile et les conciles, op. cit., pp. 27-28.
111. G. Bardy, La Théologie de l'Eglise de saint Irénée au concile de Nicée (Paris 1947), p. 77.
112. Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica, VII.30, 2.
113. G. Bardy, Paul de Samosate (Louvain 1929), p. 352.
114. Eusebius, Vita Constantini III.6; Rufinus, Historia ecclesiastica, I.1.
115. Cited from H.G. Optiz, Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites (Berlin 1935), p. 36.

116. On the importance of numbers, see Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica, V.24, 8; VII.5, 5; 7, 5; 28, 1; 29, 1; Cyprian, Ep. 55, 6; Athanasius, Ep. contra Arianos, ad honoratissimos in Africa episcopos 2 (PG 26, 1032); on unanimity, Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica, V.33, 4; Cyprian, Ep. 67, 6.

117. H. Marot, art. cit., pp. 42-3.

118. P.-T. Camelot, O.P., 'Les conciles oecuméniques des IVe et Ve siècles', Le Concile et les conciles, op. cit., p. 49.

119. Optatus, Contra Parmenianum Donatistam, appendix, - Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, XXVI.207.

120. Leo, Ep., 90; 114, 1. See further F.X. Funk, 'Der römische Stuhl und die allgemeinen Synoden des christlichen Altertums', Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift, 64 (1882), pp. 561-602; J. Forget, 'Le rôle des papes dans la convocation des huit premiers conciles', Mélanges Moeller (Louvain 1914), I, pp. 179-191.

121. Athanasius, Ad episcopos Aegyptiae et Lybiae, 13. R. Devréesse concluded from his survey of such material that the language of ecumenicity remains in general within the 'Byzantine horizon', 'Le 5e concile et l'oecumenicité byzantine', Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati, III (Vatican City 1946), pp. 1-15. C.f. V. Laurent, 'L'unité du monde vue de Byzance et son expression dans les conciles généraux des neuf premiers siècles', Divinitas, 3 (1961), pp. 252-269. H. Chadwick has even suggested that the primary significance of 'ecumenical' was tax-exemption, as in third century assemblies of professional associations in the Empire: 'The origin of the title "Ecumenical Council"', Journal of Theological Studies 23 (1972), pp. 132-5. Naturally, this does not exclude that such councils enjoyed a consciousness of

what is now termed ecumenicity but expressed it by other linguistic means. Moreover, the orbis of Augustine's pertinent references is surely universal in the full sense. For Augustine, the ecumenical councils represent the universi orbi auctoritas, De Baptismo, II, 4, 5; and their decrees express the universalis ecclesiae consensus, ibid., VII.53, 103. Hence they are a proclamation of the universal Church: Contra Crescentium, I.33, 30, and virtually equivalent to revelation itself, De Baptismo, VI.39, 76. See F. Hoffmann, 'Die Bedeutung der Konzilien für die kirchliche Lehrentwicklung nach dem heiligen Augustinus', in J. Betz and H. Fries (ed.), Kirche und Überlieferung (Freiburg 1960), p. 86. On the application of the language of inspiration to councils, see H. Bacht, 'Sind die Lehrentscheidungen der Ökumenischen Konzilien göttlich inspiriert?', Catholica, 13 (1959), pp. 128-139.

122. Sozomen, Historia ecclesiastica, I.17.
123. J. Hefele, H. Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, III/1 (Paris 1909), pp. 484-5; Maximus Confessor, Disputatio cum Pyrrho, PG 91, 352; Theodore of Studion, Ep. 2172, = PG 99, 1306; John of Damascus, Adversus Constantinum, 16, = PG 95, 332; Mansi XIII, 207-10.
124. Mansi XVI, 7; 35.
125. Nicholas of Cusa, De concordantia catholica, III, 3. N.b. In the fourteenth century Nilus of Rhodes reckoned Constantinople IV ecumenical on this ground: see D. Stiernon, Constantinople IV (Paris 1967), p. 218.
126. V. Peri, I concili e la chiesa (Rome 1965).
127. Y. Congar, '1274-1974. Structures ecclésiales et conciles dans les relations entre Orient et Occident', Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques 58, 3 (1974), p. 375.

128. P.-T. Camelot, O.P., 'Les conciles oecuméniques des IV^e et V^e siècles', art. cit., p. 54.
129. Ibid., pp. 54-5.
130. H. Marot, 'Les conciles romains des IV^e et V^e siècles et le développement de la primauté', Istina (1957), pp. 435-462.
131. W. de Vries, 'Das Selbstverständnis der Ökumenischen Konzile des ersten Jahrtausends von ihrer Lehrautorität', Ökumene, Konzil, Unfehlbarkeit (Innsbruck 1979), p. 72. De Vries points out elsewhere that Chalcedon, for example, required unconditional acceptance of its teaching, 'Die Struktur der Kirche gemäss dem Konzil von Chalkedon', OCP, 35 (1969), pp. 63-122. However, he admits that the Third and Fifth Ecumenical Councils may not have seen themselves expressly in this light.
132. As stressed by H.J. Sieben, Die Konzilsidee in der alten Kirche (Paderborn 1959).
133. Y. Congar, 'Konzil als Versammlung und grundsätzliche Konziliarität der Kirche', Gott in Welt. Festgabe für Karl Rahner (Freiburg 1964), II, pp. 135-165.
134. K. Mörsdorf, 'Das synodale Element der Kirchenverfassung im Lichte des zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils', in Volk Gottes. Zum Kirchenverständnis der katholischen und anglikanischen Theologie. Festgabe für Joseph Höfer (Freiburg 1967), pp. 568-584. The portrait of the ecumenical council offered in Christus Dominus, 4 is expressed in terms of a theology of the college, as is the account of the creation of the international Synod of Bishops found in the Motu proprio Apostolica sollicitudo of 15.9.1975. See here Y. Congar, 'Synode épiscopale, primauté et collégialité épiscopale', in

- Ministères et communion ecclésiale (Paris 1971), pp. 187-227; C. Munier, Vatican II. La charge pastorale des évêques (Paris 1969), pp. 329-332. Extraordinarily, Afanasev appears to have overlooked the synodal element in Eastern ecclesiology: see on this P. Duprey, p.b., 'La structure synodale de l'Église dans la théologie orientale', Proche Orient Chrétien, XX (1970), pp. 1-22, = 'The synodical structure of the Church in Eastern theology', OC, VII.2-3 (1971), pp. 152-179.
135. Y. Congar, '1274-1974, Structures ecclésiales et conciles dans les relations entre Orient et Occident', art. cit., p. 369; c.f. J. Ratzinger, 'Zur Theologie des Konzils', in Catholica, 15 (1961), pp. 292-304; = Das neue Volk Gottes. Entwürfe zur Ekklesiologie (Düsseldorf 1969), pp. 147-170.
136. H. Küng, Structures of the Church (London-New York 1964), pp. 1-25, and here at p. 12. For an alternative account of the Church's conciliarity, see J.D. Zizioulas, 'The Eucharistic Community and the Catholicity of the Church', art. cit., pp. 325-326.
137. B. Tierney, The Foundations of the Conciliar Theory (Cambridge 1955), pp. 46 ff.
138. H. Jedin, A History of the Council of Trent (Edinburgh 1961), II, pp. 23-26.
139. H. Küng, Structures of the Church, op. cit., p. 23. Küng goes on to show how the concil actualises the one church as holy, catholic and apostolic - the other three 'marks', pp. 23-25.
140. Jn 14, 16f, 26; 16, 13f.
141. A. Grillmeier, 'Konzil und Rezeption. Methodische Bemerkungen zu einem Thema der Ökumenischen Diskussion',

Theologie und Philosophie, 45 (1970), pp. 321-352, following F. Wiesacker, Privatrechtsgeschichte der Neuzeit (Göttingen 1967²).

142. Y. Congar, 'La réception comme réalité ecclésiologique', RSPT, 56 (1972), pp. 369-483, and here at p. 370.
143. See A.M. Ritter, Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol (Göttingen 1965).
144. J. Coman, 'The doctrinal definitions of the Council of Chalcedon and its reception in the Orthodox Church of the East', The Ecumenical Review, 22 (1970), pp. 362-382; also A. Grillmeier, 'The reception of Chalcedon in the Roman Catholic Church', *ibid.*, pp. 383-411.
145. First clearly made by pope Damasus, and perhaps as early as the Roman synod of 368 (during his pontificate). The earliest absolutely formal statement is by Nicholas I: see PL 119, 773D, 788C, 882C, 897C, 947A. Y. Congar, L'Eglise, *op. cit.*, p. 62. Via such classic articulations as that of Thomas (ST IIa IIae 1, 10), and the Conciliarist crisis of the Latin church, this claim will eventually lead to a recognition of the superiority of the pope over a general council. But in an earlier epoch this question is not posed: co-operation between pope and councils is assumed.
146. M. Perez de Ayala, De divinis apostolicis et ecclesiasticis traditionibus (Cologne 1549), I.1.
147. Cited in Y. Congar, 'La réception comme réalité ecclésiologique', *art. cit.*, p. 376.
148. *Ibid.*, pp. 379-380.
149. A.S. Khomiakov, L'Eglise Latine et le protestantisme au point de vue de l'Eglise d'Orient (Lausanne 1872), pp. 32,

- 62; B. Plank, Katholizität und Sobornost. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Katholizität der Kirche bei den russischen Theologen in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts (Würzburg 1960), p. 69; R. Slenczko, Ostkirche und Ökumene. Die Einheit der Kirche als dogmatisches Problem in der neueren ostkirchlichen Theologie (Göttingen 1962), pp. 61-79.
150. W. Hryniewicz, O.M.I., 'Die ekklesiale Rezeption in der sicht der orthodoxen Theologie', Theologie und Glaube, 65 (1975), pp. 251-2. Among Orthodox critics are M. Bulgakov, F. Gumilevski, P.N. Trembelas, J. Karmiris, J. Romanides, S. Harkianakis, D. Staniloae and A. Stavrovsky, *ibid.*, p. 260.
151. Y. Congar, 'La réception comme réalité ecclésiologique', *art. cit.*, p. 399. C.f. H. Bacht, 'Vom Lehramt der Kirche und in der Kirche', Catholica, 25 (1971), pp. 144-167.
152. J. Zizioulas, 'The Theological Problem of "Reception"', Centro pro Unione Bulletin, 26 (1984), p. 6.
153. Discourse of Paul VI to the Roman Secretariat for Christian Unity on 28.4.1967; see Documentation Catholique, 64 (1967), p. 870. For a general account of ecumenical discussion about the papacy, see J.M. Miller, What are They Saying about Papal Primacy? (Ramsey, N.J. 1983).
154. On the Papacy as an obstacle to Orthodox-Catholic reunion, see E. Lanne, 'Jusqu'à quel point une primauté romaine est-elle inacceptable pour les églises orientales?', Concilium, 64 (1971), pp. 53-57; S. Harkianakis, 'Un ministère pétrinien dans l'Église peut il avoir un sens? Une réponse grecque orthodoxe', *ibid.*, pp. 103-108.

155. Maxime de Sardes, Le Patriarchat oecuménique dans l'Eglise orthodoxe (Paris 1975), pp. 21, 22.

156. Y. Congar, '1274-1974. Structures ecclésiales et conciles dans les relations entre Orient et Occident', art. cit., p. 359.

157. Letter to patriarch of Constantinople of 2.8.1206, PL 215, 959. For the pentarchy idea, see H. Marot, 'Note sur la Pentarchie', Irenikon, 32 (1959), pp. 436-442; M. Marelllo, 'La Pentarchia. Storia di un idea', Nicolaus, L (1974), pp. 127-193.

158. Bonaventure, In IV Sent., d.24.

159. Denz.-Schönm. 861.

160. Such a 'Petrine theory' of the patriarchal sees appears as early as Gregory the Great. See Acta Romanorum Pontificum a S. Clemente I (c. 90) ad Coelestinum III († 1198). I: Pontifica Commissio ad redigendum codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis Fontes. Series III, Volume I (Vatican City 1943), p. 498, no. 268. This collection will henceforth be cited as 'ARP'.

161. On the origins of the patriarchal system see T.A. Kane, The Jurisdiction of the Patriarchs of the Major Sees in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages (Washington 1949); E. Lanne, 'Églises locales et patriarchats à l'époque des grands conciles', Irenikon, 34 (1961-3), pp. 292-321; Y. Congar & B.-D. Dupuy (ed.), L'Épiscopat et l'Eglise universelle (Paris 1962), pp. 261-276, 591-636; W. de Vries, 'Die Entstehung der Patriarchate des Ostens und ihr Verhältnis zur päpstlichen Vollgewalt. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Episkopat und Primat', Scholastik, 37 (1962), pp. 341-369, = 'The Origin of the Eastern Patriarchates and their Relationship to the power of the Pope', OC, II.1 (1966), pp. 50-69; II.2 (1966), pp. 130-142.

162. W. de Vries, art. cit., OC, II.1, pp. 55-6.
163. ARP, p. 103, no. 36 (Innocent I); p. 247, no. 117; p. 251, no. 119; p. 270, no. 129 (all Leo I); p. 679, no. 328 (Nicholas I).
164. Ibid., p. 770, no. 369: 'terminos, quos patres nostri fixerunt, nulli arroganter transgredi conceditur'.
165. V. Grumel, Les Regestes des actes du patriarchat de Constantinople (Istanbul 1932 ff.), passim; see also A. Coussa, Epitome praelectionum de Iure ecclesiastica orientale (Grottaferrata 1948), p. 248.
166. ARP, p. 679, no. 328.
167. See W. de Vries, S.J., 'The Origin of the Eastern Patriarchates and their relationship to the power of the Pope', art. cit., pp. 132-133; A. Fliche, 'Le problème oriental au second concile oecuménique de Lyon (1274)', OCP, 13 (1947), pp. 465-485; the account of the relation between Papacy and patriarchate is taken from the profession of faith of the emperor Michael Palaeologus, 6 July 1274, see Denz.-Schönm. n.861.
168. See W. de Vries, 'The Origin of the Eastern Patriarchates and their relationship to the power of the pope', art. cit., p. 133: for the crucial phrase salvis videlicet privilegiis omnibus et iuribus eorum, see Denz.-Schönm., n. 1308.
169. E. Candal, Joannes de Torquemada O.P. Apparatus super Decretum Florentinum Unionis Graecorum (Rome 1942), p. 114.
170. J. Braun, Die liturgische Paramente in Gegenwart und Vergangenheit (Freiburg 1924), p. 144.

171. W. de Vries, 'The Origin of the Eastern patriarchates and their relationship to the power of the pope', art. cit., p. 141.
172. Unitatis redintegratio, 16.
173. J. Rupp, Message ecclésial de Soloviev. Présage et illustration du Vatican II (Paris-Brussels 1975), pp. 434-439; A. Ehrhard, Die Orientalische Kirchenfrage und Oesterreichs Beruf in ihrer Lösung (Vienna-Stuttgart 1899), pp. 69-71; *ibid.*, Die altchristliche Kirchen im Westen und im Osten. I. Die griechische und die lateinische Kirche (Bonn 1937), pp. 161-166; Hiéromoine Pierre, 'L'union de l'Orient avec Rome. Une controverse récente. Correspondance échangée S.B. Mgr. Chrysostome Papadopoulos et Mgr. Georges Calavassy', OCP, XVIII.1 (1930); Y. Congar, 'Le pape comme patriarche d'Occident. Approche d'une réalité trop négligée', Istina, 28 (1983), pp. 374-390. The pope's patriarchal ministry in the Latin church is the basis for the overwhelming majority of interventions by the Holy See in the life of the particular churches. For attitudes to the patriarchal office in the modern West see G. Dejaifve, 'Patriarches et Primauté de Vatican I à Vatican II', Pluralisme et Oecuménisme en Recherches Théologiques. Mélanges S. Dockx (Gembloux 1976), pp. 193-218.
174. A marked advance on Pius IX's Reversurus (1867), according to which the patriarchal dignity was conceded by the Roman See.
175. The doctrine of Pastor aeternus is recapitulated by the Second Vatican Council at Lumen Gentium 13; 18; 22; 23; 45; Christus Dominus 2; 6; Orientalium Ecclesiarum 3, 7; Ad Gentes 22. See E. Innocenti, La Santa Sede nella ecclesiologia del Concilio Vaticano Secondo (Rovigo 1977²). But, as Innocenti writes, 'La saldatura è avvenuta

preservando il primato ma temperando la visione monarchica della Chiesa con la chiara affermazione dommatica della collegialità gerarchica', p. 197.

176. For Pastor aeternus itself, see the text and commentary in U. Betti, La Costituzione dommatica 'Pastor Aeternus' (Rome 1961). On the importance of the prologue, see J.M.R. Tillard, 'L'horizon de la "primauté" de l'évêque de Rome', Proche Orient Chrétien, 25 (1975), pp. 217-244. By reference to Leo the Great, the prologue carries a hint of an ecclesiology of communion, giving as the purpose of the primacy the guardianship of the cohesion of communion between the Churches (through their pastors). See also F. Kerr, 'Vatican I and the Papacy (1): a proud appellation', New Blackfriars (April 1979), pp. 169-170.
177. R. Aubert, Vatican I (Louvain 1964), especially pp. 144-157, 195-235.
178. The foundational study is: P. Batiffol, Cathedra Petri (Paris 1938); see also M. Maccarrone, Apostolicità, episcopato e primato di Pietro (Rome 1976).
179. G. Barraclough, The Mediaeval Papacy (London 1968); W. Ullmann, A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages (London 1972), pp. 142-250.
180. B. Tierney, The Origins of Papal Infallibility 1150-1350 (Leiden 1972); for Aquinas, see Y. Congar, O.P., 'Saint Thomas Aquinas and the infallibility of the papal magisterium', The Thomist, XXXVIII (1974), reprinted in Thomas d'Aquin, sa vision de théologie et de l'Eglise (London 1984), pp. 81-105; G. Rocca, O.P., 'St. Thomas Aquinas on papal authority', Angelicum, 62 (1985), pp. 472-484.
181. See especially his Disputationes de controversiis

christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos
(Ingolstadt 1588-1593), I.5; X. Le Bachelet, 'Bellarmin,
François-Robert-Romulus', DTC 2, 1, cols. 589-591.

182. R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., pp. 28-34.
183. On Gallicanism at large, see V. Martin, Les origines du gallicanisme (Paris 1939).
184. For the full text of the articles, see C. Gérin, Recherches historiques sur l'assemblée du clergé de 1682 (Paris 1870²), pp. 317 ff.
185. See T. Ortolan, 'Fébronius', DTC, V.2, cols. 2115-2124.
186. For Hontheim's subsequent recantation, see O. Meyer, Febronius. Weihbischof Johann Nicolaus von Hontheim und sein Widerruf (Tübingen 1880). The full title of the De statu ecclesiae is Justinii Febronii jurisconsulti De statu praesenti Ecclesiae et legitima potestate romani pontificis, liber singularis, ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione compositus. As the title implies, the book's aim was 'ecumenical': to restore Christian unity by confirming papal authority within its primitive limits. The preface exhorts the pontiff to renounce what he may consider certain rights for the love of peace: these rights being only of econdary utility for the government of the Church. If he does not renounce these rights, really usurped powers, voluntarily, the bishops should constrain him, assisted if need be by the secular arm. Condemned by a decree of the Congregation of the Index for 27.2.1764, the work aroused an enormous furore: the writings in response fill almost two columns of the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique. The ninth century compilation, self-ascribed to 'Isidorus Mercator' and utilised by Hontheim, was made in the Frankish lands around 850. The intention was not to exalt the Roman church but to render ecclesiastical order and law independent of lay

control. Little used by the ninth century popes after their acceptance in Rome in 864, they were abundantly drawn on by the Gregorian Reformers. See Y. Congar, 'Les Fausses Décrétales, leur réception, leur influence', RSPT, 57 (1975), pp. 279-288.

187. Espen's Ius ecclesiasticum universum (Louvain 1700), placed on the Index in 1704, was considerably more moderate than his De promulgatione legum ecclesiasticarum (Brussels 1721). See F. Laurent, Van Espen. Étude historique sur l'Église et l'État en Belgique (Brussels 1860); K. Weinzierl, Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, 2.III, 1107.
188. G.C. Neller, Principia juris publica ecclesiastica catholicorum ad statum Germaniae accommodata (Frankfurt-Leipzig 1746).
189. M.C. Goodwin, The Papal Conflict with Josephinism (New York 1938). Note, however, that in true Josephinism, no corpus ecclesiasticum as such was envisaged at all. All churchmen stood before the State as individual persons: F. Maas, 'Josephinism', New Catholic Encyclopaedia, VII, p. 1119.
190. J. Casseyre, 'Tamburini, Pietro', DTC, XV.1, cols. 30-34.
191. B. Ricci, 'Il maggiore teologo giansenista d'Italia', Scuola cattolica, 49 (1921), pp. 14-25, 276-291, 358-369.
192. P. Tamburini, Praelectiones de iustitia christiana et de sacramentis (Pavia 1783-1784).
193. Id., La vera idea della Santa Sede (Pavia 1784; Milan 1818). The Vera Idea contains all of Tamburini's distinctive ideas on the papacy, though he went on to write more on this and related subjects, notably in his De fontibus sacrae theologiae deque constitutione et indole Ecclesiae

christianae ejusque regimine (Pavia 1789-90) and in the Lettere teologico-politiche su la presente situazione delle cose ecclesiastiche in which, writing in the 1790's, he deplored the decline of probity in Church affairs since the removal by death of Joseph II. It is possible that a treatise De tolerantia ecclesiastica et civili in sensu Josephi Secundi ascribed to Thaddeus, count Trautmannsdorf is in fact Tamburini's work. His last book, a two-volume Praelectiones de Ecclesia Christi et universa jurisprudentia ecclesiastica, published in Cologne two years after his death was placed on the Index of Prohibited Books in 1847.

194. On the progress of Ultramontanism in the nineteenth century, see J.B. Bury, A History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century (London 1930).

195. R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., p. 30.

196. For a characterisation of the 'New Ultramontanism' of W.G. Ward, see C. Butler, The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne (London 1926), II, pp. 41-44; also id., The Vatican Council 1869-70, based on bishop Ullathorne's letters (London 1930), I, pp. 72-75. W. Ward's neologism 'Neo-Ultramontane' is found, and explained, in his William George Ward and the Catholic Revival (London 1912), p. 85. For W. Ward's opposition to the tendency, see M. Ward, The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition (London 1934-8), pp.

197. On such 'infaillibilité séparée', see J.M.R. Tillard, L'Évêque de Rome (Paris 1982), pp. 38-39.

198. J. Friedrich, Ignaz von Döllinger (Munich 1899-1901). Döllinger's critique of the work of the Council, centred in the 'Letters of Janus', 1869, and 'Letters of Quirinius', 1869-70, may be found in his Briefe und Erklärungen über die vatikanischen Dekrete (Munich 1890).

199. J.R. Palanque, Catholiques libéraux et gallicans en France face au concile du Vatican (Aix-en-Provence 1962); for the theological background, see A.G. Martimort, Le Gallicanisme de Bossuet (Paris 1953).
200. D. Mathew, Lord Acton and his Times (London 1968).
201. On Strossmayer, see F. Šišić, Josi Juraj Strossmayer. Dokumenti i korespondencija (Zagreb 1933).
202. Mansi LI, 539-553. An annotated version is offered in H. Clérissac, Le Mystère de l'Église (Paris 1921²).
203. Mansi LI, 645-50.
204. R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., pp. 148-156. For the text see Mansi LIII, 308-317. See F. van der Horst, Das Schema über die Kirche auf dem I. Vatikanischen Konzil (Paderborn 1963).
205. R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., pp. 129-130.
206. Mansi LI, 701-2.
207. R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., p. 197.
208. See H. Marot, O.S.B., 'The Primacy and the de-centralization of the early Church', Concilium, 7 (1965), pp. 9-16. On the issue of universal jurisdiction Butler commented shrewdly: 'Though at the time of the Council it was the infallibility that raised the greatest storms, alike outside the Council and in, and still at this day is the great bugbear of the Protestant mind, I cannot help thinking that the matter of the primacy, as defined in the third chapter of the Dogmatic Constitution of July 18, in reality presents much greater obstacles to that united Christendom in communion with the apostolic

see of Rome and its bishop that is in our day increasingly the dream and the object of prayer and of striving of countless men of goodwill still outside that communion', The Vatican Council, op. cit., p. 71.

209. R. Aubert, 'Documents concernant le tiers-parti au concile du Vatican', Abhandlungen über Theologie und Kirche. Festschrift K. Adam (Düsseldorf 1952), p. 252.
210. R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., pp. 202-209.
211. Ibid., pp. 210-211. This text was later dropped, justification for which is offered by Butler who points out that Manning and Senestrey had good grounds for their contention that the formula put forward by Martin and Billio, if enacted by the Council, would be taken as an authoritative Conciliar pronouncement on the theological controversy over the extent of the Church's infallibility at large, deciding it in favour of the opinion that limits the infallibility to the sphere of things immediately revealed by God: The Vatican Council, op. cit., II, pp. 127-128.
212. R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., pp. 211-214. It was Rauscher of Vienna, a leader of the Minority, who succeeded in re-wording the essential definition (D 3060) in such a way as to affirm the 'ordinary' nature of episcopal jurisdiction, C. Butler, The Vatican Council, op. cit., II, pp. 78-9. Note also that in the session of 5 July, Federico Zinelli, bishop of Treviso, speaking for the Deputation for the Faith, added a paragraph prior to the definition of papal jurisdiction to the effect that the bishops as successors of the apostles were true pastors in their dioceses. When an extreme Ultramontane objected, he was told that this change was absolutely necessary to satisfy the objection that the ordinary and immediate jurisdiction of the bishops in their dioceses would be nullified by the proclamation

of the episcopal authority of the Roman pontiff:

R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., p. 224; Mansi LII.1311.

But at the same time, at the insistence of Manning, a statement was also added, relative to the canons following the definition, that in the exercise of his supreme jurisdiction, it was false to say that the pope had only the 'principal part' not the 'total plenitude' of this supreme power: tantum potiores partes, non vero totam plenitudinem huius supremæ potestatis, R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., pp. 224-225. Canon III added to this Chapter is clearly directed against Hontheim and Tamburini.

213. Mansi LII, 530-70.

214. R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., pp. 217-218.

215. Ibid., pp. 219-220.

216. The crucial Antoninus text is his Summa Theologiae, III. tit.23, c.3, iv. See on this U. Betti, 'L'autorità di S. Antonino e la questione dell' infallibilità pontificia al Concilio Vaticano', Memorie dominicane, 76 (1955), 173-192.

217. Mansi LII, 1204-1230.

218. R. Aubert, Vatican I, op. cit., pp. 229-230

219. Mansi, LII, 1325 —

220. The term jurisdictio does not necessarily have a legal denotation: see G. Thils, 'Réflexions sur la jurisdiction ecclésiastique', Revue Théologique de Louvain, 2 (1971), pp. 129-144, where it is pointed out that the term has covered in past usage such different valencies as: whatever power of the apostolic ministry is distinct from that of order, the power to judge, the power to

legislate and the power to govern.

221. C.f. K. Rahner, J. Ratzinger, Episcopat und Primat (Freiburg 1961), p. 34.
222. C.f. J.M.R. Tillard, L'Évêque de Rome (Paris 1982), p. 31.
The term relecture is preferable to the alternative 'revision' since it underlines the necessity for identity of doctrinal content in successive presentations: but c.f. G. Thils, La Primauté pontificale. La doctrine de Vatican I. Les voies d'une révision (Gembloux 1972).

Conclusion - Notes

1. See especially G. Dix, 'The Ministry in the Early Church', in K.E. Kirk (ed.), The Apostolic Ministry. Essays on the history and the doctrine of episcopacy (London 1946), pp. 183-304.
2. P. Batiffol, L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme (Paris 1922), p.x.
3. G.Dix, Jurisdiction in the Early Church. Episcopal and papal (London 1938; 1975), especially pp. 97-124.
4. H. Jedin, 'Ist das Konzil von Trient ein Hindernis für die Wiedervereinigung?', Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis 38 (1962), pp. 841-855.

Appendix A - Notes

1. B. Schultze, S.J., Die Schau der Kirche bei Nikolai Berdiaew (Rome 1938), p. 6.
2. For Berdyaev's account of the term 'spirit' and its history, see his Dukh i realnost. Osnovi bogočelovečeskoj dukhnovnosti (Paris 1937), pp. 18 ff.
3. Ibid., p. 49.
4. N.A. Berdyaev, Filosofiya svobodnago dukha. Problematika i apologiya khristianstva (Paris 1929), I, pp. 45-51.
5. Ibid., I, p. 146; c.f. N.A. Berdyaev, Ya i mir objektov. Opit filosofii odinočestva i obščeniya (Paris 1934), p. 109.
6. Cited by B. Schultze, S.J., Die Schau der Kirche bei Nikolai Berdiaew, op. cit., p. 41. Schultze points out that for Berdyaev Glaube and Wissen are ultimately indistinguishable.
7. N.A. Berdyaev, Filosofiya svobodnago dukha, op. cit., II, p. 194.
8. Ibid., II, p. 191.
9. Ibid., II, pp. 192-3. Berdyaev claimed to find a Catholic version of the same theses in P. Lippert, Die Kirche Christi (Freiburg 1931): see B. Schultze, Die Schau der Kirche bei Nikolai Berdiaew, op. cit., p. 79, where Lippert is reported as speaking of a threefold way to the Church through experience, concept and faith. For Berdyaev's indebtedness to Khomiakov see ibid., pp. 108-117, and N.A. Berdyaev, A.S. Khomiakov (Moscow 1912). There, at p. 12, Berdyaev remarks of J. Samarin's proposal that Khomiakov

be declared a doctor of the Church:

In this lay, naturally, a friendly exaggeration, but also a fragment of truth. Since the time of the ancient doctors, the Orthodox East knew no theologian of such power as Khomiakov.

Nevertheless Berdyaev criticised what he saw as a naive populism in Khomiakov, as well as his polemic against the Western Church, *ibid.*, pp. 86-87, and his lack of both a doctrine of mysticism, p. 95, and a cosmology, p. 142.

10. N.A. Berdyaev, Filosofiya svobodnago dukha, op. cit., II, p. 195.
11. *Ibid.*, II, p. 200.
12. *Ibid.*, II, p. 197.
13. B. Schultze, Die Schau der Kirche bei Nikolai Berdiaew, op. cit., p. 97.
14. N.A. Berdyaev, Filosofiya svobodnago dukha, op. cit., II, p. 199.
15. Vasily Vasilyevich Rozanov (1856-1919); Konstantin Nikolayevich Leontyev (1831-1891): see H. Dahm, 'The outlook for philosophy and the fate of the Slavophile utopia', in G.G. Katkov et al. (ed.), Russia Enters the Twentieth Century (London 1971, 1973), p. 253. On Leontyev, see N.A. Berdyaev, Konstantin Leontyev. Očerki iz istorii Russkoi religioznoi misli (Paris 1926). For Berdyaev's critical comments on both thinkers, see his Dukhovnii krizis intelligentsii. Stati po obščestvennoi i religioznoi psikhologii: 1907-1909 g. (St. Petersburg 1910), pp. 235-236; 249-250.
16. B. Schultze, Die Schau der Kirche bei Nikolai Berdiaew, op. cit., p. 52.

17. N.A. Berdyaev, Dukhovnii krizis intellezentsii, op. cit., p. 6.
18. N.A. Berdyaev, Filosofiya svobodnago dukha, op. cit., II, p. 207.
19. See his Smisl tvorčestva. Opit opravdaniya čeloveka (Moscow 1916); c.f. Berdyaev's autobiographical statement on the 'creative vocation of man' in Samopoznanie. Opit filosofiskoi avtobiografii (Paris 1949); E.t., Dream and Reality (London 1950), p. 205. See on this P. Klein, Die 'kreative Freiheit' nach Nikolai Berdiaiew. Zeichen der Hoffnung in einer gefallenen Welt (Regensburg 1976).
20. N.A. Berdyaev, Sudba Rossii. Opit po psikhologii voini i natsialnosti (Moscow 1918), pp. 291 ff.; Filosofiya svobodnago dukha, op. cit., II, p. 207; for a comparison with the Gnosis of the late antique world, see T. Danzas, 'Les réminiscences gnostiques dans la philosophie religieuse russe', Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, XXV (1936), pp. 659-685.
21. N.A. Berdyaev, Dream and Reality, op. cit., p. 54.
22. N.A. Berdyaev, Dukh i realnost, op. cit., pp. 158-159.
23. As in his 'Orthodoxie und Ökumenizität', in N. von Arseniew and A. von Martin (ed.), Die Ostkirche (Stuttgart 1927), p. 15.
24. N.A. Berdyaev, Dream and Reality, op. cit., p. 158.
25. C.f. E. Lampert, Nicolas Berdyaev and the New Middle Ages (London 1945), pp. 53-55.
26. On the theme of freedom as the key to Berdyaev's thought, see M.A. Vallon, An Apostle of Freedom (London 1960); F.

Nucho, Berdyaev's Philosophy: the existential paradox of freedom and necessity (London 1967). Though Schelling is comparatively rarely referred to in Berdyaev's work, that work is incomprehensible without a recognition of the vast influence of Schelling in nineteenth century Russian thought. See V. Setschkareff, Schellings Einfluss in der russischen Literatur der zwanziger und dreissiger Jahre des XIX Jahrhunderts (Berlin 1939); L. Müller, 'Schellings Einfluss in Russland', Archiv für Philosophie, 3 (1949), pp. 53-81. Summing up this literature Père Xavier de Tilliette has commented that it is in the Slav world that Schelling 'a trouvé les plus ferventes et durables adhésions', Schelling. Une philosophie en devenir (Paris 1970-1971), I, pp. 495-6. On Schelling's sources in this regard, see F.O. Kile, Die theologischen Grundlagen von Schellings Philosophie der Freiheit (London 1965).

27. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Zur Frage nach der Weisheit Gottes', Kyrios, 1 (1936). Bulgakov's views drew on him the condemnation of the Karlovtsy Synod on 18.3.1927, and of the Karlovtsy Council on 17.9.1935, as well as of the Moscow patriarchate on 7.9.1935 and 27.12.1935. See C. Lialine, 'Le débat sophiologique', Irénikon, 13 (1936), pp. 168-205; B. Schultze, S.J., 'Der gegenwärtige Streit um die Sophia, die göttliche Weisheit, in der Orthodoxie', Stimmen der Zeit, 137 (1940), pp. 318-324. For the grim reception of the Paris theologians at the first international congress of Orthodox theology in Athens in the late autumn of 1936, see C. Dumont, 'En marge du premier congrès de théologie orthodoxe', Russie et Chrétienté, I (1937), pp. 54-77. For Bulgakov's life see his own Avtobiografičeskiya zametki (Paris 1944); L. Zander, 'Vater Sergius Bulgakoff', Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 36 (1946), pp. 17-30.
28. S.N. Bulgakov, 'The Problem of the Church in modern Russian theology', 133 (1931), pp. 63-69; 134 (1931), pp. 9-14. The idea was expressed as early as the Great War in Bulgakov's Svet Nevečernii (Moscow 1917).

29. S.N. Bulgakov, Pravoslavie (Paris 1965), p. 38; c.f. L'Orthodoxie (Paris 1932), p. 9.
30. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Očerki učeniya o tserkvi', in Put, 1 (1925), p. 57, = 'Die Lehre von der Kirche in orthodoxer Sicht', Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 47 (1957), p. 173.
31. S.N. Bulgakov, 'The Problem of the Church in modern Russian theology', art. cit., p. 69.
32. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche in orthodoxer Sicht', art. cit., pp. 174-177.
33. Ibid., p. 179.
34. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Sv. Graal', Put, 32 (1932), pp. 3-42.
(One notes here Bulgakov's distance from the anti-Filioquist polemic of Vladimir Lossky, particularly clear in his Utesitel. O Bogočelovečestve, II (Paris 1936), = Le Paraclet. La Sagesse divine et la théanthropie (Paris 1946)).
35. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Apostolische Sukzession, Eucharistie und kirchliche Einheit', Hochkirche, 13 (1931), p. 260; 'Evkharističeskii dogmat', Put, 20 (1930), pp. 29 ff.
36. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche in orthodoxer Sicht', art. cit., p. 184.
37. S. Świerkosz, S.J., L'Eglise visible selon Serge Bulgakov. Structure hiérarchique et sacramentelle (Rome 1980), p. 5.
38. P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche: Zur Entstehung und Entfaltung der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie Nikolaj Afanas'evs 1893-1966 (Würzburg 1980), pp. 101-3.

39. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Das Selbstbewusstsein der Kirche', Orient und Occident, 3 (1930), p. 5.
40. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche in orthodoxer Sicht', art. cit., p. 188.
41. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Das Selbstbewusstsein der Kirche', art. cit., p. 5.
42. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche in orthodoxer Sicht', art. cit., pp. 188 ff. C.f. 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church', Journal of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 12 (1931), p. 25. Bulgakov specifically denied that he meant to embrace here the High Anglican 'branch theory': the resemblance was purely verbal.
43. S.N. Bulgakov, Pravoslavie, op. cit., p. 206; 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church', art. cit., p. 25; 'Die Lehre von der Kirche in orthodoxer Sicht', art. cit., p. 130. Bulgakov echoed Berdyaev's contrast of Petrine and Johannine elements by way of relativising the idea of canonical authority in his Svv. Petr i Ioann. Dva pervoapostola (Paris 1926). See on this B. Schultze, 'Die Apostel Petrus und Johannes und der Primat', Orientalia Christiana Periodica, 17 (1951), pp. 203-217.
44. S. Świerkosz, L'Eglise visible selon Serge Bulgakov, op. cit., p. 39.
- 45.. S.N. Bulgakov, 'Ierarkhiya i tainstva', Put, 49 (1935), pp. 23-47.
46. S. Świerkosz, L'Eglise visible selon Serge Bulgakov, op. cit., p. 50.
47. M. Afanassieff, 'La g n se de L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit', art. cit., p. 16.

48. C.B. Schultze, S.J., 'Ekklesiologischer Dialog mit Erzpriester Nikolay Afanas'ev', Orientalia Christiana Periodica, 33 (1967); for Afanasev's references to Bulgakov, see the notes to Chapters III and IV above.
49. P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche, op. cit., p. 110.
50. G. Florovskii, 'Westliche Einflüsse in der russischen Theologie', Kyrios, 2 (1937), pp. 1-22. The biographical data come from Y.-N. Lelouvier, Perspectives russes sur l'Eglise. Un théologien contemporain: Georges Florovsky (Paris 1968).
51. G. Florovsky, Vostochnye Ottsy IV veka (Paris 1931); Vizantiiskie Ottsy V-VIII vekov (Paris 1933).
52. G. Florovsky, 'Sobornost: the catholicity of the Church', in E.L. Mascall (ed.), The Church of God (London 1934), pp. 51-74.
53. G. Florovsky, 'Westliche Einflüsse in der russischen Theologie', art. cit.; 'Patristics and modern theology', Procès verbaux du Premier Congrès de théologie orthodoxe (Athens 1939), pp. 238-242. His evaluation of Russian theology is offered in the massive Puti Russkago bogosloviya (Paris 1937). For an attempt to 'place' Florovsky's 'neo-traditionalism' within Orthodox theology today, see E. Lanne, 'L'Eglise dans la perspective de la théologie orthodoxe', Irénikon, 35 (1962), 2, pp. 173-175.
54. G. Florovsky, 'The Church: her nature and task'; 'Le corps du Christ vivant: une interpretation orthodoxe de l'Eglise'. The first became 'Christ and his Church', L'Eglise et les églises (Chevetogne 1954), pp. 159-170; the second appeared in Aut. var., La sainte Eglise universelle (Neuchâtel 1948), pp. 9-57.

55. See Y.-N. Lelouvier, Perspectives russes sur l'Eglise, op. cit., pp. 21-22.
56. M.D. Koster, Ekklesiologie im Werden (Paderborn 1940).
57. G. Florovsky, 'Christ and the Church', art. cit., p. 162.
58. G. Florovsky, 'Le corps du Christ vivant', art. cit., p. 10.
59. G. Florovsky, 'Christ and his Church', art. cit., pp. 164-5; the reference is to J.A. M  hler, Die Einheit der Kirche oder das Prinzip des Katholizismus (T  bingen 1825). See Y.-N. Lelouvier, Perspectives russes sur l'Eglise, op. cit., p. 61.
60. V. Lossky, Essai sur la th  ologie mystique de l'Eglise d'Orient (Paris 1944), pp. 171-192.
61. P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche, op. cit., pp. 79-81.
62. G. Florovsky, 'Evkharistiya i Sobornost', Put, 19 (1929), pp. 3-22.
63. Ibid., pp. 7, 9, 14.
64. P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche, op. cit., p. 81. Stress added.

Appendix B - Notes

1. I am much indebted in this section to T.F. O'Meara O.P., 'Philosophical models in ecclesiology', Theological Studies 39, 1 (1978), pp. 3-21. On the concept of model, see F. Ferré, 'Mapping the logic of models in science and theology', The Christian Scholar 46 (1963); I.G. Barbour, Myths, Models and Paradigms (London 1974). pp. 29-91.
2. R. Roques, L'Univers dionysien. Structure hierarchique du monde selon le Pseudo-Denys (Paris 1954; 1983), pp. 36-67.
3. H.F. Dondaine, Le Corpus dionysien de l'Université de Paris au XIIIe siecle (Rome 1953).
4. In Thomas Aquinas, for example, the ecclesia terrena is seen as exemplifying the ecclesia caelestis: Summa Theologiae Ia.q.106, a.3; the concept of mediation is invoked by the same writer in connexion with the sacrament of Order, Super libros Sententiarum IV.d.24, q.1, a.1. sol.1.
5. See e.g. Denys, Letters VIII.2; De hierarchia ecclesiastica VII. 3,7; 5,5. Such assertions proved acceptable to the Byzantines Symeon the Faster and Nicetas Stetathos but not to Latin theologians like Bonaventure and Thomas who considered them explicitly: see Y. Congar, L'Eglise. De saint Augustin a l'époque moderne (Paris 1970), p. 226.
6. Ib. pp. 224-230.
7. An exception is John of Turrecremata's Summa de Ecclesia where the efficient cause is Christ, the material cause the faithful, the formal cause union with Christ through faith and the final cause participation in the glory of God: see K. Binder, Wesen und Eigenschaften der Kirche bei Kardinal Juan de Torquemada O.P. (Innsbruck 1955), p. 39-40.
8. Physics 11.3,7.

**PAGE
MISSING
IN
ORIGINAL**

18. A. White, Schelling. An Introduction to the System of Freedom (New Haven and London 1983).
19. F.W.J. von Schelling, 'Von der Möglichkeit einer Form der Philosophie überhaupt', in M. Schröter (ed.), Werke (Munich 1927; 1958), I. pp. 56-57.
20. See especially at ib. I. p. 117.
21. Ib. I. p. 259, in 'Neue Deduktion des Naturrechts, IXer Brief'.
22. Ib.I. p. 714, in 'Darstellung der allgemeinen Idee der Philosophie überhaupt und der Naturphilosophie insbesondere als nothwendigen und integranten Theils der ersteren Zusatz zur Einleitung zu den Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Natur' (1797).
23. F.C. Copleston S.J., A History of Philosophy VII. op.cit. pp. 114-5.
24. F.W.J. von Schelling in M. Schröter (ed.), Werke, op. cit. II. pp. 573-4, from 'System des transzendentalen Idealismus'.
25. F.C. Copleston S.J., A History of Philosophy VII op.cit. p. 125.
26. Ib. pp. 135-6. The nature and justification of this Wende is the outstanding issue of Schellengian studies: see X. de Tilliette Schelling: une philosophie en devenir (Paris 1971), II.p.37
27. For 'Philosophie und Religion', see Werke IV. pp. 1-60.
28. Werke IV. p. 234, from 'Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit und die damit zusammenhängenden Gegenstände'.
29. Werke V. p. 239.

30. Ib. IV. p. 331, from 'Stuttgarter Privatvorlesungen' (1810).

31. Ib. V. p. 746, from 'Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie: Zweites Buch. Philosophische Einleitung in die Philosophie der Mythologie oder Darstellung der rein-rationalen Philosophie' (1850).

32. X. de Tilliette, Schelling op. cit. II. p. 460; c.f. Werke VI. p. 690, from 'Drittes Buch der Philosophie der Offenbarung. Zweiter Teil'. Joachim's developmental theology of history moves from the (Old Testament) age of the Father, characterised by fear and servile obedience and dominated by the married and the old, through the (New Testament) age of the Son, characterised by faith and filial obedience and dominated by the clergy and the young, to a coming age of the Holy Spirit, due to begin about 1260, which Joachim believed would be characterised by love and liberty, being the age of monks and infants. The visible Church of the second age was to be absorbed by the spiritual Church of the third; the clergy and hierarchy were to have a place in the spiritual order; the active life was to be absorbed by the contemplative. Jews were to be converted; Greeks and Latins to be reconciled; wars were to cease, universal love would reign, and the theology of the Beatitudes would endure to the end of the world, the evangelium aeternum of Apoc. 14,6. Taken up by the Spiritual Franciscans and carried beyond its author's intentions, Joachim's teaching was effectively repudiated by pope Alexander IV in the condemnation of the Joachimite Gherardo of Borgo San Donnino's Introductorium in evangelium aeternum. Revived in a modified form by Peter John Olivi (1248-1298) and Ubertino of Casale (c.1259-c.1329) it survived to influence a number of German writers in the Reformation period. See E. Buonaiuti, Gioacchino da Fiore: I tempi, la vita, il messaggio (Rome 1931); M.W. Bloomfield, 'Joachim of Flora. A Critical Survey', Traditio 13 (1957), pp. 249-311; M. Reeves, The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages. A study in Joachimism (Oxford 1969), pp. 3-36.

33. For Schelling's consonance with Joachimism, see M. Reeves, Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future (London 1976), p. 170.
34. S.N. Bulgakov, Sveti Petr i Joann. Dva Pervoapostola (Paris 1926); N.A. Berdyaev, Filosofiya svobodnago dukha. Problematika i apologiya christianstva (Paris 1929), II. pp. 204-10.
35. I am indebted here to A. Dulles S.J., Models of the Church (Dublin 1976).
36. See e.g. J. Beumer, 'Das Kirchenbild in den Schriftkommentaren Bedas der Ehrwürdige', Scholastik 28 (1953), pp. 40-56: Bede finds the Church in Eve and Mary, Abraham and Sarah, Tamar Rahab, Mary Magdalen, the Haemorrhissa, the mulier fortis of Proverbs, Zacchaeus, the Canaanite woman, and in the Ark, the Temple, altar and seven-branched candlestick of Jewish worship; in the seamless tunic, the Vine, the garden of Paradise. Balthasar's ecclesiology is similarly figural, seeing the Church imaged in the principal figures of the New Testament narrative. see A. Moda, Hans Urs von Balthasar (Bari 1976), pp. 169-171.
37. Ecclesiology emerged as a distinct theological topic in the context of a dispute about 'powers, i.e. the relative competence of Church and State. See J. Rivière, Le Problème de l'Eglise et de l'Etat au temps de Philippe le Bel. Etude de theologie positive (Louvain-Paris 1926).
38. X. Arquilliere, Le plus ancien Traité de l'Eglise: Jacques de Viterbe 'De regimine christiano' (Paris 1926); J. Leclercq, Jean de Paris et l'ecclésiologie du XIIIe siècle (Paris 1942).
39. S. Jaki O.S.B., Les Tendances nouvelles de l'ecclésiologie (Rome 1957), pp. 6-11. For the Spiritual Franciscans' view of the Church, see E. Benz, Ecclesia spiritualis. Kirchenidee und Geschichtstheologie der franziskanischen Reformation (Stuttgart 1934). For the sectarians, see M. Spinka, John Hus' Concept of the Church (Princeton 1966). For Conciliarism, see

- B. Tierney, Foundations of the Conciliar Theory. The contribution of the mediaeval canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism (Cambridge 1955); P. de Vooght, 'Le Conciliarisme aux conciles de Constance et de Bale', in B. Botte (ed.), Le Concile et les conciles (Paris 1960), pp. 143-181. On Juan de Torquemada see note 7 above.
40. E. Rietschel, Das Problem der sichtbar-unsichtbaren Kirche bei Luther (Leipzig 1900, 1932).
41. R. Bellarmine, Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus hujus temporis haereticos (Ingolstadt 1586-1593), II.3.ii. For Bellarmine's work at large, see J. Brodrick S.J., The Life and Works of Blessed Robert Cardinal Bellarmine (London 1928). It is significant that, congruent with his sense of two distinct, parallel societies, Bellarmine took what was for his period a minimising view of papal authority in rebus temporalibus.
42. B.C. Butler, The Idea of the Church (London 1962), p. 3.
43. J.P. Jossua O.P., Le Père Congar. La théologie au service du peuple de Dieu (Paris 1967), p. 110.
44. Y. Congar O.P., L'Eglise. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne op.cit. pp. 16-17. H. Reuter in his essay on Augustine's ecclesiology in Augustinische Studien (Gotha 1877), pp. 412ff, stresses that while for Augustine predestination includes the means of its own efficacy, baptism and the Church, yet the sacramental community is not coextensive with the community of the predestined, or even of the just alive today. Congar, in the discussion just cited, suggests that Augustine's admission that sacraments outside Catholic communion may be valid, an admission coherent with the witness of the Roman church of the period, of the 313 council of Arles and of Optatus, and fuelled by the conviction that their ultimate source is not the single episcopate of the

apostolic Church but Christ himself, led naturally to a greater stress on societal elements in ecclesiology, since otherwise the unity of the Church might be imperilled.

45. Especially important for the communion model in the wake of the German Catholic renaissance associated with the Tübingen school, is the work of Friedrich Pilgram. In dependence on Möhler, who in his early Die Einheit in der Kirche oder das Prinzip des Katholizismus dargestellt im Geiste der Kirchenväter der drei ersten Jahrhunderten (Tübingen 1825), had defined the Church as a community of the faithful realised by the Spirit of love at Pentecost, its external constitution being simply the manifestation of its essence, and who in his later Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten nach ihren öffentlichen Bekenntnisschriften (Mainz 1832, 1838) had formulated more clearly, this time in a Christological rather than pneumatological presentation, the relation between hierarchy and community, Pilgram put forward the notion that the Church is essentially a communion of free personal spirits. In opposition both to the Bellarminian account of the Church as institution and to its anti-papal Josephist and Febronian equivalent, the Church as association, Pilgram saw this communion as a divine-human reality expressing itself in the constitution of a 'city', politeia: thus his Physiologie der Kirche. Forschungen über die geistigen Gesetze in denen die Kirche nach ihrer natürlichen Seite besteht (Mainz 1860).
46. Y. Congar, Chrétiens désunis (Paris 1937). Père Jossua, in his account of Congar's ecclesiology in Le Père Congar, op.cit. points out the variety of theological methods Congar has employed in ecclesiology, ranging from the purely historical, summed up in the preface to K. Delehaye's Ecclesia Mater (Paris 1963) and dealing with the great stages of the Church's self-consciousness, through an account of the variety yet complementarity of the Church's 'names' or definitions, most notable in the introductory essay to Sainte Eglise (Paris 1963), where the Church is spoken of as people of God, Body of Christ, temple of the Holy Spirit, and communion,

to a more systematic investigation of the analytical levels on which the Church's 'living substance' may be distributed. While Chrétiens désunis is the first great example of the last type. Vraie et fausse Réforme dans l'Eglise (Paris 1950) and Jalons pour une théologie du laicat (Paris 1953) maintain the fundamental method in a different idiom, seeing the Church as simultaneously institution and community, and so enabling Jossua to seize the constant elements in Congar's ecclesiology in a definition of the Church as 'communauté recevant la vie divine grâce à une institution qui la structure et qui lui est toute relative, devenant ainsi Peuple des baptisés en marche dans l'histoire pour le salut du monde, et Corps du Christ dans lequel se répandit l'Esprit qui intériorise l'oeuvre du Seigneur', ib. pp. 111.

47. J. Hamer, L'Eglise est une communion (Paris 1962), p. 79.
48. Y. Congar O.P., 'Ecclesia et populus (fidelis) dans l'ecclésiologie de S. Thomas', in Thomas d'Aquin: sa vision de théologie et de l'Eglise (London 1984), pp. 159-173.
49. M. Koster, Ekklesiologie im Werden (Paderborn 1940); A. Vonier, Le Peuple de Dieu (Lyons 1943).
50. Lumen Gentium 9.
51. S. Grabowski, The Church. An introduction to the theology of St Augustine (St Louis 1957), pp. 3-92; G. Philips, 'L'influence du Christ-Chef sur son corps mystique', Augustinus magister (Paris 1954), pp. 805-815.
52. P.G. 89, 1340 cited in Y. Congar O.P., L'Eglise. op.cit. pp.68-9. On the patristic use of the body of Christ image in general, see E. Mersch, Le Corps mystique du Christ. Etudes de théologie historique (Brussels-Paris 1933).

53. For a chronicle of the re-emergence of the mystical body motif see F. Malmberg, Ein Leib, ein Geist (Freiburg 1960), pp. 24-38; also, A. Kerkvoorde, 'La theologie du Corps mystique au XIXe siècle', Nouvelle Revue Théologique 67 (1940-5), pp. 1025-1038.

54. See J. Hamer, 'Signification et portée de l'encyclique Mystici corporis' in L'Eglise est une communion op.cit. pp.11-34. The pope's theological adviser was S. Tromp, author of Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia I (Rome 1937). The Roman school's interest in the mystical body theme had been consistent: see W. Kasper, Die Lehre von der Tradition in der römischen Schule (Freiburg 1962); C.G. Arevalo, Some Aspects of the Theology of the Mystical Body of Christ in the Ecclesiology of G. Perrone, C. Passaglia and Cl. Schrader (unpublished dissertation, Rome 1959); Y. Congar O.P., L'Eglise op. cit. pp. 128-133.

55. K. Pelz, Der Christ als Christus (Berlin 1939).

56. L. Billot, Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi (Rome 1898; 1927), I. pp. 56ff.

57. Lumen Gentium 8.

58. H. Mühlen, Una mystica Persona. Die Kirche als das Mysterium der Identität des heiligen Geistes in Christus und den Christen: eine Person in vielen Personen (Paderborn 1966), pp. 65-74; 317-328.

59. The signal for a return to such a particularist ecclesiology, over against its universalist competitor was given in Y. Congar O.P., 'De la communion des Eglises à une ecclésiologie de l'Eglise universelle', in L'Episcopat et l'Eglise universelle (Paris 1962), pp. 227-260.

60. M.J. Scheeben, Die Mysterien des Christentums (Freiburg 1865; 1941), paragraphs 71-84.

61. H. de Lubac, Catholicisme. Les aspects sociaux du dogme (Paris 1938); O. Semmelroth, Das Kirche als Ursakrament (Frankfurt 1953); K. Rahner, Kirche und Sakramente (Freiburg 1960). In the Low Countries

- an especially valuable essay, integrating ecclesiology into Christology and a theology of the Christian life as a whole was E. Schillebeeckx O.P., Christus, Sacrament van de Godsontmoeting (Bilthoven 1960). For a full account of both ancient and modern authors using this scheme, see P. Smulders, 'L'Eglise, sacrament de salut', in G. Baraúna OFM (ed.), L'Eglise de Vatican II (Paris 1967), pp. 313-338.
62. For an account of the role of this ecclesiology in Lumen Gentium see B. Ghardini, La Chiesa è sacramento (Rome 1976).
63. O. Gonzalez Hernandez, 'La nouvelle conscience de l'Eglise et ses présupposés historico-theologiques', in G. Barsaúna O.F.M. (ed.), L'Eglise de Vatican II op. cit. p. 195.
64. P. Smulders, 'Die sakramental-kirchliche Struktur der christlichen Gnade', Bijdragen Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie 18 (1957), pp. 333-341.
65. Ib., 'L'Eglise, sacrament du Salut', art. cit., pp. 331-2.
66. H. Fries, 'Die Kirche als Träger und Vermittler der Offenbarung', Mysterium Kirche (Salzburg 1962), I p. 13.
67. R.P. McBrien, Church: the continuing quest (New York 1970), p. 11.
68. J. Hamer O.P., Karl Barth (London-Glasgow 1962), pp. 165-7; cf. C. O'Grady M.S.C., The Church in the Theology of Karl Barth (London 1968). For the importance of the visible Church to Barth, see Church Dogmatics VI/1 (Edinburgh 1965), pp. 653-4.
69. H. Küng, Die Kirche (Freiburg 1967); E.t. London 1967, p. 79; p. 92; pp. 95-6.

70. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 84: 'It becomes an ekklēsia by the fact of a repeated concrete event...'.
71. A.T. Hanson, The Church of the Servant (London 1962).
72. J. Moltmann, The Church in the Power of the Spirit (London 1977), p. 19.
73. P. Teilhard de Chardin, The Divine Milieu (New York 1960), p. 138.
74. In this respect, Afanasev's ecclesiology is reminiscent of Karl Rahner's affirmation that the Church, in manifesting its 'provenance' from the crucified and risen Jesus, is the 'permanent presence precisely of (the) eschatological and eschatologically victorious self-promise of God to the world in Jesus Christ', see 'The Church's redemptive historical provenance from the death & resurrection of Jesus', Theological Investigations XIX (London 1983), p. 32. In and through the Church, there is an irruption of the powers of the future aeon into the world, for the Church is, in Rudolf Schnackenburg's favoured phrases, the Kingdom's Trägerin or Jetztgestalt: see R. Schackenburg, 'Kirche und Reich Gottes', Una Sancta (1957), pp. 42ff and, more fully, Gottes Herrschaft und Reich (Freiburg 1959). Afanasev does not reach, however, the explicit conclusion that the Church is the sacrament of the Kingdom as in J. Mulders, 'De Verhouding Rijk Gods Kerk en de katholieke theologie', Katholiek Archief (1957), 709-28, cited J. Hamer, L'Eglise est une communion op. cit. p. 68.

Bibliography

A. Works directly on Afanasev

- M. Afanaseva, 'Kak složilas Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo', in N. Afanasev, Tserkov Dukha Sviatogo (Paris 1971), pp. i-ix.
- Ibid. (M. Afanassieff), 'La g n se de l'Eglise du Saint-Esprit', in N. Afanassieff, L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit (Paris 1975), pp. 13-22.
- Ibid. 'Nicolas Afanassieff (1893-1966). Essai de biographie', Cont. 21 (1969), pp. 99-111.
- E. Hussey, 'Nicholas Afanassiev's eucharistic ecclesiology: a Roman Catholic viewpoint', JES 12 (1975), pp. 235-252.
- A. Joos, 'Comunione universale o cattolicit  dell'assemblea. Elementi di ecclesiologia negli scritti del P. N. N. Afanassiev', Nic. 1 (1973), pp. 7-47; 223-260.
- M. Kaszowski, 'Les sources de l'eccl siologie eucharistique du P. Nicolas Afanassieff', ETHL 52 (1976), pp. 331-343.
- P. Plank, Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche. Zur Entstehung und Entfaltung der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie Nikolay Afanas'evs [1893-1966], (W rzburg 1980).
- O. Rousseau, 'In memoriam: le R.P. Nicolas Afanassieff', Ir n. 40 (1967), pp. 291-297.
- B. Schultze, 'Ekklesiologischer Dialog mit Erzpriester Nikolay Afanas'ev', OCP 33 (1967), pp. 380-403.

B. Principal other works consulted

- J. P. Audet, La Didache. Instructions des ap tres (Paris 1958).
- R. Aubert, Vatican I (Louvain 1964),
- G. Bara na O.F.M. (ed.), L'Eglise de Vatican II (Paris 1967).
- G. Bardy, La Th ologie de l'Eglise de saint Ir n e au concile de Nic e (Paris 1947).
- G. Bareille, 'Ignace d'Antioche', DTC VII.A. cols. 685-713.
- T.. D. Barnes, Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study (Oxford 1971).

- P. Batiffol, L'Eglise naissante et le catholicisme (Paris 1922).
- E. H. Benson, Cyprian: his Life, Times and Work (London 1897).
- N. A. Berdyaev, Dukh i realnost. Osnovi bogočelovečeskoj dukhnovnosti (Paris 1937).
- Ibid., Filosofiya svobodnago dukha. Problematika i apologiya (Paris 1952).
- Ibid., Samopoznaniye. Opit filosofiski avtobiografii (Paris 1949).
- Ibid., Smisl tvorčestva. Opit opravdaniya čeloveka (Moscow 1916).
- Ibid., Ya i mir objektov. Opit filosofii odinočestva i obščiniya (Paris 1934).
- U. Betti, La Costituzione dommatica 'Pastor aeternus' (Rome 1961).
- C. Bigg, The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles (London 1898).
- R. Bornert, Les Commentaires byzantins de la divine liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle (Paris 1966).
- B. Botte (ed.), Le Concile et les conciles (Chevetogne-Paris 1960).
- F. E. Brightman, 'The Historia mystagogica and other Greek commentaries on the Byzantine Liturgy', JTS 9 (1907-8), pp. 248-267; 387-397.
- S. N. Bulgakov, 'Apostolische Sukzession, Eucharistie und kirchliche Einheit', HKi 13 (1931), pp. 259-260.
- Ibid., 'Das Selbstbewusstsein der Kirche', OuO 3 (1930), pp. 1-22.
- Ibid., 'Die Lehre von der Kirche in orthodoxer Sicht', IKZ 47 (1957), pp. 168-200.
- Ibid., 'Evkharističeskii dogmat', Put 20 (1930), pp. 3-46; 21 (1930), pp. 3-33.
- Ibid., 'Ierarkhiya i tainstva', Put 49 (1935), pp. 23-47.
- Ibid., L'Orthodoxie (Paris 1932).
- Ibid., 'Očerki učenija o Tserkvi', Put 1 (1925), pp. 53-78.
- Ibid., 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church', JFAS 12 (1931), pp. 17-31.
- Ibid., Pravoslavie (Paris 1965).
- Ibid., 'Sv. Graal', Put 32 (1932), pp. 3-42.

- Ibid., Svv. Petr i Joann. Dva pervoapostola (Paris 1926).
- Ibid., 'The problem of the Church in modern Russian theology', Theol. 23 (1931), pp. 9-14; 63-69.
- Ibid., 'Zur Frage nach der Weisheit Gottes', Kyrios 1 (1936), pp. 93-101.
- C. Butler, The Vatican Council (1869-1870). Based on Bishop Ullathorne's Letters (London 1930).
- H. von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries (London 1969).
- J. Cassyre, 'Tamburini, Pietro', DTC XV.I. cols. 30-34.
- L. Cerfaux, La Théologie de l'Eglise suivant saint Paul (Paris 1948²).
- P. K. Christoff, An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Slavophilism. A Study in Ideas. I. A.S. Xomjakow (The Hague 1961).
- J. Colson, L'Evêque dans les communautés primitives. Tradition paulinienne et tradition johannique de l'épiscopat des origines à saint Irénée (Paris 1951).
- Y. M.-J. Congar, '1274-1974. Structures ecclésiales et conciles dans les relations entre Orient et Occident', RSPT 58, 3 (1974), pp. 355-390.
- Ibid., Diversity and Communion (London 1984).
- Ibid., (ed., with B. Dupuy), La Collégialité et l'épiscopat (Paris 1962)
- Ibid., L'Eglise. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne (Paris 1970).
- Ibid., 'La Réception comme réalité ecclésiologique', RSPT 56 (1972), pp. 369-483.
- Ibid., 'Rudolph Sohm nous interroge encore', RSPT 57 (1973), pp. 263-294.
- Ibid., Thomas d'Aquin. Sa vision de théologie et de l'Eglise (London 1984).
- F. C. Copleston, A History of Philosophy VII. Fichte to Nietzsche (London 1968).

- P. Coppens, 'L'Eucharistie, sacrement et sacrifice de la nouvelle Alliance: fondement de l'Eglise', in J. Gribet, (ed.), Aux Origines de l'Eglise (Paris 1965), pp. 125-158.
- J. S. Curtiss, Church and State in Russia: the last years of the empire 1900-1917 (New York 1940).
- A. d'Alès, La Théologie de Tertullien (Paris 1905).
- C. de Clercq, 'Byzantin (droit canonique)', DDC II. cols. 1170-1183.
- H. de Lubac, Corpus mysticum. L'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au moyen âge (Paris 1948²).
- Ibid., Les Eglises particulières dans l'Eglise universelle (Paris 1971).
- J. Daniélou, Origène (Paris 1948²).
- A. Demoustier, 'Episcopat et union à Rome selon saint Cyprien', Rech.Sc.Rel. 52 (1964), pp. 337-369.
- Ibid., 'L'Ontologie de l'Eglise selon saint Cyprien', Rech.Sc.Rel. 52 (1964), pp. 554-588.
- G. Dix, Jurisdiction in the Early Church. Episcopal and papal (London 1975).
- Ibid., The Shape of the Liturgy (London 1945)
- F. H. Dudden, The Life and Times of Saint Ambrose (London 1935).
- A. Dulles, Models of the Church (Dublin 1976),
- P. Duprey, 'La Structure synodale de l'Eglise dans la théologie orientale', POC 20 (1970), pp. 1-22.
- F. Dvornik, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy (Washington 1966).
- Ibid., 'Emperors, popes and councils', DOP 6 (1951), pp. 1-23.
- R. F. Evans, One and Holy. The Church in Latin Patristic Thought (London 1971).
- P. Evdokimov, 'The principal currents of Orthodox ecclesiology in the nineteenth century', ECR 10,1-2 (1978)
- A. Faivre, 'La Documentation canonico-liturgique de l'Eglise ancienne', Rev.Sc.Rel. 54 (1980), pp. 204-215.
- K. C. Felmy, Die Deutung der göttlichen Liturgie in der russischen Theologie (Berlin-New York 1984).

- P. Florenskii, Stolp i utverzhenie istinny (Moscow 1914).
- G. V. Florovsky, 'Christ and his Church', in Aut. var. L'Eglise et les Eglises (Chevetogne 1954), pp. 159-170.
- Ibid., 'Evkharistiya i sobornost', Put 19 (1929), pp. 3-22.
- Ibid., 'Le Corps du Christ vivant: une interprétation orthodoxe de l'Eglise', in Aut. var. La sainte Eglise universelle (Neuchâtel 1948).
- Ibid., 'Patristics and modern theology', Procès verbaux du Premier Congrès de théologie orthodoxe (Athens 1939), pp. 238-242.
- Ibid., 'Sobornost: the catholicity of the Church', in E. L. Mascall (ed.), The Church of God (London 1934), pp. 51-74.
- Ibid., The Ways of Russian Theology I (Belmont, Mass. 1979).
- Ibid., 'Westliche Einflüsse in der russischen Theologie', Kyrios 2 (1937), pp. 1-22.
- J. M. Ford, 'Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian heresy?', J.Ecol. Hist. 17 (1966), pp. 145-168.
- B. Forte, La Chiesa nell'Eucaristia. Per un' ecclesiologia eucaristica alla luce del Vaticano II (Naples 1975).
- E. Fouilloux, Les Catholiques et l'unité chrétienne du XIXe au XXe siècle (Paris 1982).
- W. H. C. Frend, The Donatist Church. A movement of protest in Roman North Africa (Oxford 1952).
- H. G. Gadamer, Wahrheit und Methode (Tübingen 1960).
- J. R. Geiselman, Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik (Paderborn 1926).
- S. Grabowski, The Church. An Introduction to the Theology of Saint Augustine (St Louis 1957).
- A. Gratieux, A. S. Khomiakov et le mouvement slavophile (Paris 1939).
- M. Gordillo, 'Russie (Pensée religieuse)', DTC XIV. A. cols. 207-371.
- A. Grillmeier, 'Konzil und Rezeption. Methodische Bemerkungen zu einem Thema der Ökumenischen Diskussion', TP 45 (1970), pp. 321-352.

- J. Hamer, L'Eglise est une communion (Paris 1962).
- C. V. Harris, Origen of Alexandria's Interpretation of the Teacher's Function in the Early Christian Hierarchy and Community (New York 1966).
- J. Hefele-H. Leclercq, Histoire des conciles (Paris 1907ff.).
- E. Herman, 'Balsamon (Théodore)', DDC II. cols. 76-83.
- Ibid., 'Jean Zonaras', DDC VI. cols. 129-130.
- F. Heyer, Die orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine (Cologne 1953).
- W. Eryniewicz, 'Die ekklesiale Rezeption in der Sicht der orthodoxen Theologie', TG 65 (1975), pp. 251-252.
- J. M. Hussey, (ed.), The Byzantine Empire II. Government, Church and Civilisation (Cambridge 1967).
- Ibid., The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire (Oxford 1986).
- S. Jaki, Les Tendances nouvelles de l'ecclésiologie (Rome 1957).
- J. P. Jossua, Le Père Congar. La théologie au service du Peuple de Dieu (Paris 1967).
- G. Katkov (ed.), Russia Enters the Twentieth Century (London 1971).
- C. Kern, Les Traductions russes des textes patristiques (Chevetogne-Paris 1957).
- Ibid., Evkharistiya (Paris 1947).
- F. O. Kile, Die theologische Grundlagen von Schellings Philosophie der Freiheit (Leiden 1965).
- A. Kniazeff, L'Institut Saint-Serge. De l'Académie d'autrefois au rayonnement d'aujourd'hui (Paris 1974).
- H. Küng, The Church (London 1967).
- Ibid., Structures of the Church (London 1965).
- J. Lawson, The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus (London 1948).
- J. Lécuyer, Etudes sur la collégialité épiscopale (Le Puy 1964).
- Y.-N. Lelouvier, Perspectives russes sur l'Eglise. Un théologien contemporain: Georges Florovsky (Paris 1968).
- C. Lialine, 'le Débat sophiologique', Irén. 13 (1936), pp. 168-205.

- O. Linton, Das Problem der Urkirche in der neueren Forschung. Eine kritische Darstellung (Uppsala 1932).
- N. O. Lossky, Histoire de la philosophie russe des origines à 1950 (Paris 1954).
- V. Lossky, Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'Eglise d'Orient (Paris 1944).
- D. A. Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris. The Orthodox Theological Institute (London 1954).
- G. Macy, The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period. A study of the salvific function of the sacrament according to the theologians c.1080-c.1220 (Oxford 1984).
- G. A. Maloney, A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453 (Belmont, Mass. 1976).
- R. A. Markus, Saeculum. History and Society in the Thought of Saint Augustine (Cambridge 1970).
- E. Mersch, Le Corps mystique du Christ. Etudes de théologie historique (Louvain 1936²).
- A. Michel, Die Kaisermacht in der Ostkirche (Darmstadt 1959).
- N. Milaš, Pravoslavno-tserkovno pravo (Zara 1896)
- H. Mühlen, Una mystica Persona. Die Kirche als das Mysterium der Identität des heiligen Geistes in Christus und den Christen: eine Person in vielen Personen (Paderborn 1966).
- P. P. O'Leary, The Triune Church. A study in the ecclesiology of A. S. Khomjakov (Dublin 1982).
- T. F. O'Meara, 'Philosophical models in ecclesiology', TS 39 (1978), pp. 3-21.
- T. Ortolan, 'Fébronius', DTC V.2. cols. 2115-2124.
- A. Palmieri, Theologia dogmatica orthodoxa ad lumen catholicae doctrinae examinata (Florence 1911-1913²)
- L. Peano, La Chiesa nel pensiero russo slavofilo (Brescia 1964).
- V. Peri, I Concili e le chiese (Rome 1965).
- K. Rahner-J. Ratzinger, Episcopat und Primat (Freiburg 1961).
- B. Roberg, Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem zweiten Konzil von Lyon, 1274 (Bonn 1964)

- R. Roques, L'Univers dionysien. Structure hiérarchique du monde selon le Pseudo-Denys (Paris 1983).
- F. Sagnard, La Gnose Valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée (Paris 1947).
- H.-J. Schmitz, Frühkatholizismus bei Adolf von Harnack, Rudolph Sohm und Ernst Käsemann (Düsseldorf 1977).
- B. Schultze, 'A. S. Choljakow und das Halb-Tausend Jubiläum des Einigungskonzils von Florenz', OCP 4 (1938), pp. 473-496.
- Ibid., Die Schau der Kirche bei Nikolai Berdiajew (Rome 1938).
- Ibid., 'Der Primat Petri und seiner Nachfolger nach den Grundsätzen der universalen und der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie', OCP 31 (1965), pp. 21-52; 277-294.
- H.-J. Schulz, 'Entwurf einer eucharistischen Ekklesiologie aus der gemeinsamen liturgischen Überlieferung der Kirchen des Ostens und Westens', Kyrios NF 13 (1973), pp. 101-118.
- W. A. Schoedel, Ignatius of Antioch (Philadelphia 1985)
- W. Setschkareff, Schellings Einfluss in der russischen Theologie der zwanziger und dreissiger Jahre des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (Leipzig 1939).
- R. Slesinski, Pavel Florensky. A metaphysics of love (Crestwood, N.Y. 1984).
- H. J. Sieben, Die Konzilsidee in der alten Kirche (Paderborn 1979).
- R. Sohm, Das altkatholische Kirchenrecht und das Dekret Gratians (Munich-Leipzig 1918),
- Ibid., Kirchenrecht I (Leipzig 1892).
- Ibid., Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus (Berlin-Leipzig 1912).
- M. Spinka, The Church and the Russian Revolution (New York 1929)
- Ibid., The Church in Soviet Russia (New York 1956).
- J. Steinmann, Tertullien (Paris 1967).
- D. Stone, A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (London 1909).
- S. Świerkosz, L'Eglise visible selon Serge Bulgakov. Structure hiérarchique et sacramentelle (Rome 1980).

- D. Strémoukhoff, Vladimir Soloviev et son oeuvre messianique (Strasbourg 1935).
- G. Thils, La Primauté pontificale. La doctrine de Vatican I. Les voies d'une révision (Gembloux 1972).
- Ibid., 'Réflexions sur la juridiction ecclésiastique', Rev. Théol. Louv. 2 (1971), pp. 129-144.
- J.M. Tillard, L'Eucharistie, pâques de l'Eglise (Paris 1964).
- Ibid., L'Evêque de Rome (Paris 1982).
- X. de Tilliette, Schelling. Une philosophie en devenir (Paris 1970-1971).
- E. van der Meer, Augustine the Bishop (London 1961).
- F. E. Vokes, The Riddle of the Didache (London 1938).
- W. de Vries, 'The origin of the Eastern patriarchates and their relationship to the power of the Pope', OC. 2,1 (1966), pp. 50-59; 2,2 (1966), pp. 130-142.
- G. G. Willis, Saint Augustine and the Donatist Controversy (London 1950).
- N. Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (London 1963).
- J. Zizioulas, 'La communauté eucharistique et la catholicité de l'Eglise', Ist. 14 (1969), pp. 67-88.
- Ibid., Hē henotēs tēs Ekklesiās en tē theia Eucharistia kai tō Episkopō kata tous treis prōtous aiōnas (Athens 1965).

Abbreviations

APER	'L'Apôtre Pierre et l'évêque de Rome'
BAJO	<u>Bulletin de l'action religieuse et pédagogique pour la jeunesse des pays orthodoxes</u>
BRPK	<u>Byulleten Religiozno-Pedagogičeskago Kabineta</u>
CTOR	'Le concile dans la théologie orthodoxe russe'
Cont	<u>Contacts</u>
ČTVS	'Čto takoe vselenskii sobor?'
CVZE	<u>Cerkovnyi Vestnik Zapadno-Evropeyskago Pravoslavnago Russkago Ekzarkhata</u>
Denz.-Schönm	H. Denzinger-A. Schönmetzer, <u>Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum</u> (Barcelona-Freiburg 1967)
DDC	<u>Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique</u>
DTC	<u>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique</u>
DVVS	<u>Državna vlast na vaselyenskim saborima</u>
DOP	<u>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</u>
DIVTs	'Dve idei vselenskoj Tserkvi'
ECR	<u>Eastern Churches Review</u>
EDC	'L'Eglise de Dieu dans le Christ'
EPA	'L'Eglise qui préside dans l'Amour'
ETHL	<u>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</u>
GregPa	<u>Gregorios ho Palamas</u>
GTS	'Granitsy Tserkvi'
IKZ	<u>Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift</u>
Irén.	<u>Irénikon</u>
Ist.	<u>Istina</u>
JEcolH	<u>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</u>
JES	<u>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</u>
JFAS	<u>Journal of the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius</u>
JTS	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>

KKS	'Kanoni i kanoničeskoe sobranie'
KO	<u>Kirche im Osten</u>
Mansi	G. D. Mansi, <u>Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio</u> (Lucca 1758-1798.....)
MessOrth	<u>Messenger Orthodoxe</u>
Nic	<u>Nicolaus</u>
NoA	<u>Nu och Alltid</u> (Stockholm)
NVTsK	'Neizmennoe i vremennoe v tserkovnikh kanonakh'
OC	<u>One in Christ</u>
OCP	<u>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</u>
PenOrth	<u>Pensée Orthodoxe</u>
PravMysl	<u>Pravoslavnaya Mysl</u>
PSRIVS	'Provintsialniya sobraniya Rimskoi imperii i vselenskie sobori'
RecScRel	<u>Recherches de Sciences Religieuses</u>
ROCE	'Réflexions d'un orthodoxe sur la collégialité des évêques'
RSPT	<u>Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques</u>
Re	<u>Revue Théologique de Louvain</u>
SA	'Le sacrement de l'assemblée'
SVSQ	<u>Saint Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly</u>
Sob.	<u>Sobornost</u>
SO	'Statio orbis'
Theol	<u>Theologia</u>
ThG	<u>Theologie und Glaube</u>
TP	<u>Theologie und Philosophie</u>
TS	<u>Theological Studies</u>
TG	<u>Trapeza Gospodnya</u>
TsiZ	<u>Tsrkva i Zivot</u>
TsDSv	<u>Tsrkov Dukha Sviatogo</u>
US	'Una Sancta'

VRSchD Vestnik Russkago Studenčeskago Christianskago
Dviženiya

VS 'Vselenskie sobory'

Also: MPG J. P. Migne, Patrologia Graeca (Paris 1857ff.)

MPL J. P. Migne, Patrologia Latina (Paris 1841ff.)